

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. XVII.—APRIL, 1892.—No. 66.

THE CATHOLIC IDEA IN PROPHECY.

THE idea which is made real and actual in the Catholic Church is presented in prophecy in a two-fold manner. It is foreshadowed in facts and events of ancient historical religion. It is foretold in predictions of the prophets.

The Catholic idea of the Church presents it as a visible kingdom of God reigning through Christ, on the earth.

It is visible, not directly in all its essence, attributes and qualities, but mediately through certain external phenomena. Man is visible, though his soul is not an object of ocular vision or even of immediate intuition, by means of certain sensible phenomena of his body. In this sense Jesus Christ was visible, as St. John writes: "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the word of life." (1 Ep. John, i. 1.)¹

The body of Jesus was visible, audible and tangible, in the same sense and the same way with other bodies. Through His visible human figure, His Person, as the Word Incarnate, and the Person of the Father, were made the object of a mediate and obscure intellectual vision, "as in a glass darkly," to minds enlightened by divine faith.

"If ye had known Me, ye would have known My Father also: and henceforth ye will know Him, *and ye have seen Him*. Philip saith to Him: Lord show us the Father, and it is enough for us. Jesus saith to him: So long a time have I been with you; and

¹ All Scripture quotations in this article are taken from Kenrick's *Revised Douay Version*.

have ye not known Me? Philip, he who seeth Me, seeth the Father also." (John xiv., 7-9.)

The Church, like man, is composed of soul and body, and is immediately visible as to her face and figure, mediately as to her interior essence and spiritual qualities. The composite being man, spiritual and material, soul and body, is one substantial whole, and as such he is a visible being and person, not simply visible as some kind of colored object of sight. So the Church, as to soul and body, outward form and inward spiritual essence, is one; and as a total being is visible.

The Church is the Bride of Christ. As the Bridegroom is incarnate and visible, the Bride is incorporate and visible.

The Protestant doctrine of the Church is the precise contrary of the Catholic doctrine. According to the Protestant doctrine the Church is invisible, all soul and not at all body, purely spiritual and in no wise incorporated. For, although Protestants speak of a visible Church, they intend to express by this term only an abstract concept, a logical, universal, a potential and not an actual whole, having only subjective but no actual parts existing in a real organic unity. They do not believe in a visible, catholic body, substantially one with its invisible soul. For them, a visible, corporate church is a particular society, which is one of a great number of similar churches, which are not, either singly or in the aggregate, substantially one with the invisible Church.

The Catholic idea of the Church presents it not merely as a visible, organic whole, composed of a body, and a soul which animates it, both subsisting together in substantial unity; but, also, as the medium of faith and justification for individual believers. Moreover, as in man, the body is logically and metaphysically prior to the soul which informs it, so the body of the Church is prior to its soul; the visible, corporate society is prior to the communion of saints in the spiritual life of faith and charity. The existence and development of the rational spirit in man, depend on the physical conditions of conception, birth, and corporeal environment. God formed the body of Adam from the earthy material which is the substratum of inorganic and organic substances, and then breathed into him a rational soul, *a spirit*, which vivified his body. Each man receives the rational soul which God creates, on condition of physical generation within the human species, as an individual member of the human race.

In like manner God formed the visible body of the Church, from the same material elements which constitute other human societies, and breathed into it the spirit of life. Individual Christians receive their new, spiritual life by regeneration in and from the Church, the redeemed humanity organized into a divine

society, whose founder and head is Christ, the Second Adam. The Church is the medium of justification, and, since faith, as the Council of Trent has defined, is "the root of all justification," the Church is a medium by which the faith is conveyed and transmitted to the faithful. The Church imparts through the ministry of the word and the sacraments, to each individual man, the faith and the sanctifying grace which give life to his soul, uniting him to the soul of the Church and to Jesus Christ, in the communion of the Holy Spirit, "the Lord and Giver of Life."

The Protestant doctrine of faith and justification is altogether different from this, and is, indeed, the specific difference and critical point in the original, genuine Protestantism of Luther, Calvin, and their disciples.

According to this doctrine saving faith is immediately infused into the soul of the individual by the Holy Spirit, and by means of it, as the instrumental cause, and by it alone, he is instantaneously and perfectly justified, a partial and gradual sanctification by a distinct and continuous grace following as a necessary consequence. Historical belief in the word of Christ, which is a necessary condition for saving faith, is conveyed to the mind through the Scriptures, made intelligible by a supernatural light, and prescribed to these illuminated persons as their only and sufficient rule of belief and practice. The whole number of these enlightened and sanctified persons, united by the interior bond of grace, are the invisible, universal Church. This true Church of Christ does not depend, consequently, on anything external and visible, on polity, sacraments, creeds, and common association, for existence, unity and perpetuity. The salvation of the individual soul does not depend on outward connection with any particular society, or the use of any sensible ordinances. It is an affair between himself and God, which has been finally settled to his advantage, when he received justification by faith alone.

Still, the moral necessity of association in churches, for public worship and other religious purposes, is recognized. The reason of being for these societies is, however, of a different and lower kind from that of the Church in the Catholic sense. The essential difference between the Catholic and Protestant idea is that in the former the visible Church is prior to the invisible; in the latter, the order is reversed. In the one, the Church makes Christians; in the other, Christians make churches.

The Protestant theory is one which it is impossible to reduce to practice. Protestants are inconsistent; but this what is to be expected, since Protestantism is the result of accident, a ruin, not a planned and organized structure, a heap of *débris* thrown into the position which it occupies by the effect of an explosion. There-

fore, in practice, Protestants have, in a measure, acted according to the Catholic idea of the Church.

A certain High Church party, who love to call themselves Catholics, even repudiate explicitly the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith alone and the invisible Church, and profess in a modified form the Catholic doctrine of the Church as the medium of faith and justification. But, rejecting the papacy and the concrete, visible unity of the Catholic Church as one kingdom, under one supreme head, they are thrown back on the concept of a visible and complete organization of the Church in each separate diocese, under its particular bishop. Therefore, on their theory, the *Catholic Church* is only an abstract, potential whole. Societies comprising many bishops and churches are only voluntary associations.

The Greeks have no theory. In practice they are a species of Protestants. Formally, they are inconsistent Catholics in a state schism. Constructively, they are a kind of Protestant Episcopalians. For all these sects which have, or pretend to have, an episcopal hierarchy derived from the Catholic episcopate by descent, there is no Catholic Church, nor even any Oriental or Anglican Church, existing in actual, organic unity. These are only many particular churches, connected among themselves into several accidental wholes, which are mere aggregations, with more or less intercommunion between separate societies, each one of which is held together either by the political power of a State, or by mutual confederations.

The Catholic Church stands singular and alone. It is *sui generis*, having a perfect theory of One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church, and a real, actual existence in organic unity, from the time of Christ to the present day; the divinely instituted and ordinary means of salvation for all mankind, until the end of the world.

It is the object of the present article to prove that this Catholic idea of the Church is the idea presented in prophecy, from Genesis to the Apocalypse, in the prophetic foreshadowing of the Messianic kingdom by religious history, and the spoken predictions of the same by inspired prophets.

Everything ordered by the providence of God to bring species and individuals to their perfection and ultimate end is proportioned to their several essences and natures. A purely intellectual and spiritual hierarchy is consonant to the nature of pure spirits. It is unsuitable for man, who is a rational *animal*, having a composite essence and a dual nature. Besides, since individuals of the human species have a common origin by generation from one pair of ancestors, there is a solidarity of the whole race unlike the social bond which unites the angels, who were created each one

singly by himself, and, according to St. Thomas, a distinct species. It is, therefore, suitable to human nature that the whole order for bringing men to their last end should be in the visible and sensible sphere and related to the human race in solidarity as well as to individuals taken singly.

In point of fact, in the original state of mankind, the supernatural endowments giving integrity and elevation to human nature were conferred on Adam for himself and all his posterity. His first probation was the probation of the race, his sin and fall involved his descendants, and the promise of redemption and restoration included all who were liable to incur original sin and its consequences by their natural generation. If Adam had not sinned all would have inherited an integral and elevated nature. Because he sinned, all, with one single exception, who have received their existence by purely natural generation have inherited a fallen nature; and because of redemption by the second Adam all have been conceived and born in a state of nature fallen but capable of reparation. The Redeemer was promised as the seed of the woman, the brother by blood of all the offspring of Eve. He is the Saviour of the race, *ipso facto*, by becoming the Saviour of its first parents, Adam and Eve. There is a solidarity in the new order of grace, and each human individual is in a state of inchoate reconciliation and salvation as a member of the redeemed race of mankind.

In this new order a new generation of sons of God had to be formed from the sons of Adam, by the regeneration of grace, so that those who were naturally conceived and born in original sin, and who were liable to become sinners by actual transgression, might be sanctified and provided with all necessary means for obtaining pardon and for meriting the Kingdom of Heaven. That is to say, a church had to be formed within the human family and society.

The sacred history shows us that the Adamic race was constituted as a universal church with one faith, one worship, whose principal rite was sacrifice, a priesthood composed of heads of families and eldest sons and one moral code. When the race of Cain fell away from this primitive communion it became restricted to the descendants of Seth, and as most of these became degenerate it became still further restricted, and at the epoch of the deluge Noah and his family became the source of a new generation of the sons of God. Later on Abraham was called to become a new father of the faithful, and his grandson, Jacob, became the founder of a peculiar people, which developed into the nation and kingdom of Israel and of Judah until the coming of the Messiah.

This general history of the faith and religion manifests clearly

the Catholic idea of the Church. There is not a trace of the Protestant idea of a revelation embodied in a book which is the rule of faith to each individual and interpreted by his private judgment. From the beginning the revelation is committed to a sacred community, a church, which preserves the sacred deposit as a tradition taught to the people from childhood by authority through parents, elders, patriarchs, priests and prophets. All sacred writings are sanctioned, preserved and interpreted by an ecclesiastical authority. Faith in the one God and the Messiah is the treasure and the trust of a kingdom whose characteristic belief and hope and glory it is, from whose royal family directly, and from whose hereditary priesthood collaterally, the Messiah is to spring.

The ancestors, precursors and types of the Messiah from Adam to David exhibit in their persons the two great traits of His character as the king and high priest over the kingdom and church of God.

Adam is the sovereign and the pontiff of the human race in its primitive unity, as one political and ecclesiastical society in its elementary and inchoate form, gradually developing from the original germ of the family with its paternal government and domestic altar into a more complete polity. Noah fulfils the same office in the new world which emerges from the waters of the deluge. Melchisedec, a special type of Christ, is a king and priest. Moses is the supreme civil and ecclesiastical lawgiver of the children of Israel. Although certain special functions of the high priesthood are committed to Aaron, and sacerdotal power is separated from civil jurisdiction in the tribe of Levi and the Aaronic family, it is by Moses that Aaron is consecrated, and by him that the chosen people of God is organized and conducted to the Promised Land. The kingdom and church of Israel is one and the same society under two distinct aspects. David, as a king chosen and consecrated by the direct appointment of God, is the supreme head and ruler over the nation, which is both a kingdom and a church. He is the founder of the Holy City, Jerusalem, the author of the grand plan which Solomon executed, according to which the Temple with its hierarchy became the centre of national worship as the capital of the kingdom which at first embraced all Israel, and afterwards, by the revolt of the ten tribes, was diminished to the kingdom of Judea.

In these and other precursors and types the Messiah is revealed as a conqueror, a founder, a lawgiver, a prophet, priest and king. When one correlate is explicitly revealed the other correlate is revealed implicitly. Wherefore, the personal traits of the Messiah just mentioned imply the kingdom and church with the organized

institutions, hierarchy, laws, rites and ethical code of a perfect and unequal society over which the Messiah is the supreme head.

In the inspired writings of the prophets the coming of the Messiah as a priest and a king is explicitly foretold. His sacred ecclesiastical spiritual kingdom, its extension, glory and ultimate triumph, the new law by which it is governed, its new priesthood and sacrifice, are not only implicitly but even distinctly and explicitly predicted in these Messianic prophesies.

Jacob foretold the royal Messiah as the Lion of the Tribe of Judah in his prophetic benediction of his sons on his deathbed.

"Juda, thee shall thy brethren praise; thy hand shall be on the necks of thy enemies; the sons of thy father shall bow down to thee. Juda is a lion's whelp; to the prey, my son, thou art gone up; resting thou hast couched as a lion, and, as a lioness, who shall rouse him? The sceptre shall not be taken away from Juda nor a ruler from between his feet¹ ('this alludes to natural descent,' Kenrick) till He comes who is to be sent, and He shall be the expectation of nations." (Gen. xlix., 8, 9, 10.) His Hebrew name is Shiloh. Kenrick says that "the meaning of this term cannot easily be determined." Jahn maintains that it means "Him for whom" the power is reserved. The Vulgate probably represents the same reading (*i.e.*, without the *Yod*) by way of paraphrase. It is generally admitted, even by the Rabbins, that the term regards the Messiah. The sceptre should not be taken away until Shiloh, the Messiah, should come; and much less afterwards for his sceptre rules all nations until He gives up his kingdom to the Father.

King David frequently foretold his royal descendant and heir, as appointed to be a king having a universal sway:

"But I am appointed by Him King over Zion, His holy mountain proclaiming His decree. The Lord hath said to me, thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." (Ps., ii., 6, 7.)

"Lift up your gates, O ye Princes, and be ye lifted up, O eternal gates, and the King of glory shall enter in. Who is the King of glory? The Lord strong and mighty" (xxiii., 7-8).

"Beautiful above the sons of men; grace is poured abroad on Thy lips—therefore hath God Blessed Thee forever. Gird thy sword upon Thy thigh, O Thou most mighty, with Thy comeliness, and Thy beauty set out, proceed prosperously, and reign. . . . Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever,² the sceptre of Thy kingdom is a sceptre of uprightness. Thou lovest justice and hatest iniquity: therefore God (in the vocative case, O God—Rosen-

¹ "From between his feet," this is literal from the Hebrew. "From his loins" is the translation of the reading of the Latin Vulgate.

² Quoted in proof of the divinity of the Son, in Hebrews, i., 8.

mueller, Kenrick, and all ancient interpreters), Thy God hath anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above Thy fellows." A direct prophecy of the Church immediately follows.

"The queen stood on Thy right hand in gilded clothing. . . . All the glory of the king's daughter is within (the interior of the palace—Kenrick), in golden borders, clothed round about with embroidery. . . . Instead of thy fathers, sons are born to Thee; Thou shalt make them princes over all the earth. (xliv., 3-18).

"Give to the king, Thy judgment, O God: and to the king's son Thy justice. . . . And he shall continue with the sun, and before the moon, throughout all generations. . . . And He shalt rule from sea to, and from the river to the ends of the earth. . . . And all the kings of the earth shall adore Him: all nations shall serve Him. . . . And in Him all the tribes of the earth shall be blessed: all nations shall magnify Him." (lxxi., 2-17.)

The prophet Zachariah foretells in magnificent language the coming of the Messiah as king and priest.

"Hear O Jesus, Thou high-priest (Joshua son of Josedec) Thou and Thy friends that dwell before Thee, for they are portending men (men who foreshadow extraordinary events—Kenrick) for behold, I WILL BRING MY SERVANT THE SPROUT. . . . And thou shalt take gold and silver, and shalt make crowns: and thou shalt set them on the head of Jesus, the son of Josedec, the high-priest. And thou shalt speak to Him, saying: thus saith the Lord of hosts, saying, BEHOLD A MAN, THE SPROUT IS HIS NAME; and under him shall he spring up, and shall build a temple to the Lord and He shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon His throne; and He shall be a priest upon His throne. . . . And they that are far off shall come, and shall build in the temple of the Lord. (Zach., iii., 8, vi., 11, etc.).

In these prophecies of the king and priest who was to come, prophecies of the kingdom and church are both implicitly contained and also explicitly connected and interwoven. There are many others which are specially devoted to sublime and glowing descriptions of this spiritual and ecclesiastical kingdom. One of these from the prophet Isaiah, will suffice as a specimen.

"Arise, be enlightened, O Jerusalem, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. . . . And the Gentiles shall walk in thy light, and kings in the brightness of thy rising. . . . And the children of strangers shall build up thy wall: and their kings shall minister to thee. . . . Thou shalt no more have the sun for thy light by day, neither shall the brightness of the moon enlighten thee: but the Lord shall be to thee for an everlasting light, and thy God for thy glory." (Is. ix. 1, etc.).

There may have been some partial fulfilment of these prophecies

in epochs of prosperity granted to the Jewish people before Christ, and there may be yet to come a similar and higher fulfilment in a restoration of Jerusalem and the converted race of Judah ; but it is evident that the Christian Church is their principal object, Jerusalem, the temple, and the kingdom of Judah, are the types and beginnings of a City of God which is co-extensive with the world. The sceptre remains with Judah until Shiloh comes, and He is the "expectation of nations," who reigns "from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth." The new city and commonwealth of God are identified with Jerusalem and Judea, because in them was the beginning of the Messianic kingdom ; the prefatory law, ritual and polity which was developed into the New Law, the universal religion, the Catholic hierarchy and Church.

The nature and law of every development are determined by the specific essence of the germ. The acorn virtually contains the oak, the embryo the animal, the elements and principles of the completed revelation of God, of the Church in its final, organic perfection, are contained in all the foregoing dispensations, from Adam to Moses, to David, to Christ. In the beginning faith and order are in the simplest forms which can be conceived as sufficient for unity and continuity. In the process of time there is a transformation of the patriarchal religion into the elaborate, highly organized Church of God in Israel. When the Messiah promulgated the new law and founded the Christian, universal Church, his earthly kingdom, abolishing the Mosaic law as a local and temporary institution, the law of development which had been strictly enforced from the beginning, was not abrogated, but executed in a more perfect manner. According to this divine law, the visible Catholic Church was necessarily made a more highly organized body than the one for which it was substituted. If the family becomes a tribe, the tribe a kingdom, by development, the kingdom can be developed into a greater and more complex commonwealth only by changing into an empire. The confederation of the States of our own country, after independence was gained, could develop into a more perfect Union only by becoming a compact Republic, coalescing into a Nation, with its Federal and State Constitutions co-ordinated and combined into a political unity.

It is the same with the kingdom of God upon earth. The whole series of prophecies respecting the Messiah and His kingdom presents Judea, Jerusalem and the Temple, as types and beginnings which are to be fulfilled and developed in a most splendid manner during the last ages of the world. The grand object placed in view is a City of God, a new Jerusalem, to which all nations are to flow, into which the redeemed are to be gathered

from all parts of the earth, from which they are to receive light, peace, and all manner of blessings. The idea of a universal spiritual and ecclesiastical kingdom, over which Christ reigns as a king, a lawgiver, a priest, a dispenser of doctrine and grace, implies a polity, a hierarchy, a tribunal of truth and justice, a liturgy, sacraments, a perfect organic constitution, sufficient to bind all nations together during all ages in one faith, religion and moral law.

Moreover, there are explicit prophecies in respect to these several things.

First: The teaching office and authority of the Church, the constitution of the *Ecclesia Docens* is set forth in prophecy, particularly by the Prophet Isaiah.

"And in the last days, the mountain of the house of the Lord¹ shall be established on the top of the mountains." There is a similar prophecy of Micah. "And it shall come to pass in the last days that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be prepared on the top of mountains and high above the hills: and peoples shall flow to it." "And it shall be exalted above the hills: and all nations shall flow unto it. And many peoples shall go, and say: come and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord and to the house of the God of Jacob, and He will teach us His ways, and we will walk in His paths; for the law shall come forth from Sion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." (Is. ii. 2, 3; Mic. iv. 1.)

The wise and learned commentator, Archbishop Kenrick, remarks upon these passages: "This prophecy has direct reference to the kingdom of the Messiah, which strictly belongs to the last dispensation. Judah is mentioned because the Messiah, according to His human nature, was to descend from this tribe. Jerusalem was the figure of the Church, which is the seat of His power. The great resemblance of these predictions is remarkable (viz. of Isaiah and Micah). Joel likewise has similar passages. The Church is the house of God. It appears as a mountain on the top of mountains, high above all the kingdoms of the earth. It is like a city seated on a mountain, which cannot be hidden."

We may also apply the prophecy specially to the Roman Church ruling supremely among and over the great patriarchal and primatial churches of Alexandria, Antioch, Ephesus, Carthage, Canterbury, etc.

The indefectibility of the Church is foretold in these words:

"This is my covenant with them, saith the Lord; My spirit that is in Thee, and My words that I have put in thy mouth,

¹ The hill on which the temple was built was called "the mountain of the house."

shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and forever." (Is. lix. 21.)

The perpetual teaching office of the prelates and doctors of the Church is set forth in these words:

"Upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, I have appointed watchmen all the day and all the night; they shall never hold their peace." (lxii. 6.)

What do these and other glowing predictions of the glory and light emanating from God immediately upon the Holy City, Jerusalem, signify, if not the gifts of the Holy Spirit, the supernatural illumination with which the Church is pervaded, the infallibility of the Church in the Holy See, œcumenical councils and the universal episcopate; the wondrous wisdom of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church Catholic; the splendor of her sacred science, and the brilliant reflection of the beauty of truth in the arts of architecture, sculpture, painting, poetry, music and eloquence?

The priesthood and sacrifice of the New Law are also explicitly foretold:

"The Lord hath sworn, and He will not repent: Thou art a priest forever, according to the order of Melchisedec." (Ps. cix. 4.)

The anointing of a new high priest, whose type was called the Righteous King, who was king of Salem, *i.e.*, the City of Peace, and also a priest, offering a special oblation of bread and wine and who both antedated and surpassed in dignity, as St. Paul affirms,¹ the Levitical priesthood; implies the founding of a line of priests under the new law and under Christ, its sovereign pontiff, who should supersede and in every way excel the priesthood of the old law.

Isaiah, in foretelling the coming of the Messiah as the Christ or Anointed of God, the prophet and high priest of the new covenant, foretells also explicitly, as a consequence of His mission, the election and commission of a line of teachers, priests and rulers in the Church.

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me. . . . And strangers shall stand and shall feed your flocks; and the sons of strangers shall be your husbandmen and the dressers of your vines. But ye shall be called the priests of the Lord; to you it shall be said: Ye ministers of our God; ye shall eat the riches of the Gentiles and ye shall pride yourselves in their glory." (Is., lxi., 1, 5, 6.)

Theodoret comments on these verses as follows:

¹ Heb. v. 6; vii. 17.

"For from foreign nations came the governors of the Church, whom he has named shepherds and ploughmen and vine-dressers. But those most blessed ones had the name Apostle as their chief and peculiar title. For although these (bishops) have succeeded to their work, no one dares to arrogate to himself their name. He calls those the seed and offspring of the Holy Apostles who have succeeded to their office of preaching." (Succinct. in Esai. Interpr.).

Christ is a priest *in modo excellentissimo*, as immediately sent by the Father and anointed by the Holy Spirit. The apostles were priests *modo excellentiori*, as immediately commissioned by Christ and vested with extraordinary powers exceeding those which they transmitted to the Popes who succeed to the primacy of St. Peter, and to the bishops who succeeded to the ordinary episcopal office of the apostles. Wherefore, after the apostolic age, the title of apostle was reserved to the first rulers of the Church, the fathers and founders of the hierarchy. Yet the priesthood of the apostles, in all the plenitude of its dignity and power, was transmitted to their successors; and the full primacy of ordinary jurisdiction given to the prince of the apostles was transmitted to his successors in the Roman See. And besides these heirs of the full pontifical office of the apostles, the sacerdotal character was given by ordination to a greater number who were associated with them to assist them in the sacred ministry as priests of the second order, and deacons were also set apart to act as the Levites of the new law in the Christian sanctuary.

There are several passages in the prophets where the vocation of Gentiles to the priesthood is explicitly foretold.

"I come that I may gather them together with all nations and tongues; and they shall come and shall see my glory. And I will set a sign among them, and I will send of them that shall be saved (Heb., "those that escape." "The apostles and other Israelites coming to Christ escaped the calamities which fell upon the nation"—Kenrick). To the Gentiles into the sea, into Africa and Lydia, them that draw the bow (Heb., "Thaershish, Pul. and Lud."); into Italy and Greece (Heb., "Thubal and Javan"), to the islands afar off, to them that have not heard of Me and have not seen My glory. And they shall declare My glory to the Gentiles. . . . And I will take of them to be priests and Levites, saith the Lord. For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I make stand before Me, saith the Lord; so shall your seed stand and your name. And there shall be month after month, and Sabbath after Sabbath; all flesh shall come to adore before Me, saith the Lord." ("The perpetuity of the Christian solemnities is signified"—Kenrick.) (Is., lxvi., 18-23.)

The prophet Jeremiah makes a similar prediction of the priesthood of the new law in the Messianic kingdom.

"Behold the days are coming, saith the Lord, that I will perform the good word that I have spoken to the house of Israel and to the house of Juda. In those days and at that time I will make the bud of justice spring forth unto David; and he shall do judgment and justice in the earth. In those days shall Juda be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell securely; and this is the name that they shall call Him, the Lord, our just one. For thus saith the Lord, there shall not be wanting unto David a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel. Neither shall be wanting *of the priests and Levites* a man before My face to offer holocausts and to burn, sacrifice and to kill victims continually. And the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah, saying: Thus saith the Lord, if My covenant with the day can be made void, and my covenant with the night that there should not be day and night in their season; also my covenant with David My servant may be made void, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne, and with the *Levites and priests My ministers*. As the stars of heaven cannot be numbered, nor the sand of the sea be measured, so will I multiply the seed of David My servant and *the Levites My ministers*." (Jer., xxxiii., 14-22.)

Theodoret comments upon these verses as follows:

"The fulfilment of this prophecy we see. For a new covenant having been given, according to the divine promise, there has been given also a priesthood after the order of Melchisedec; and those who have received it offer to God continually a reasonable sacrifice. After these things he says, inasmuch as day cannot be turned into night or night into day, so it cannot be that the kingdom of David should be destroyed. And of this prophecy the fulfilment is manifest. For Christ, who sprung from the seed of David according to the flesh, has not His throne placed upon the earth, but sitting upon the same throne with the Father governs all things. And he says also the same of the priests and Levites; that their race shall be compared with the celestial host and with the sand of the sea. Facts themselves bear testimony to these words. For the whole earth and the sea is full of high priests and deacons performing the Levitical office." (Interpr. in Jer., xxxiii.)

Historical facts from the fifth century downward give us who live in this age a much more extensive view of the fulfilment of this prophecy in Christendom than that which was within the scope of Theodoret's vision. In the Catholic Church there have been between 200 and 300 sovereign pontiffs, some 80,000 bishops and 8,000,000 of priests since the days of the apostles. If this be not the fulfilment of the prophecy of Jeremiah it is nothing but a fabric of clouds in the sunshine of poetic rapture. What the

final and complete fulfilment of the prophecies foretelling the extension and glory of the Church will be we may conjecture, and hope that it will far exceed that which has been hitherto seen; but we cannot know before the future becomes the past and present. One thing we do know, by our faith in the veracity of God, that the Catholic Church, with its sacerdotal hierarchy, is like the solar system in stability and perpetuity. In one respect the interpretation of Theodoret comes short. The prophet, speaking as the name and by the revelation of God, says: "I will multiply the seed of David." Analogy requires that in like manner as the priesthood of Christ is verified in a perpetual line of priests exercising the sacerdotal office on the earth, his royal power should be verified in a line of vicegerents exercising supremacy over the Church militant, which is His kingdom in this world. The papal supremacy was fully recognized in the fifth century, the age of Theodoret. But the epoch of Gregory the Great had not yet come. The Roman empire had not yet been overthrown, the decadence of the Eastern patriarchates had not yet left the Roman Church in a solitary grandeur, the new Western Christendom, under the spiritual and temporal monarchy of the Popes, had not risen in majesty upon the ruins of Græco-Roman civilization. The special fulfilment of the prophecy in the Roman Church is therefore more conspicuously and brilliantly manifested in the history of the Church since the seventh century than it was during the earlier period of the formation of Christendom.

Malachi, the last of the prophets, declared it to be a universal principle and law, that the priesthood is the divinely-appointed institution for the custody and teaching of the revealed truth and law of God.

"For the lips of the priest keep knowledge; and they seek the law at his mouth; because he is the messenger (angel) of the Lord of hosts." (Mal. ii., 7.) The Christian priesthood is far more perfect than the patriarchal or Levitical. The new law is a far more perfect system than the old law; therefore the endowments of the Catholic hierarchy must have a proportionate excellence; and as the *Ecclesia Docens*, it must have higher and more abundant gifts of the Holy Spirit.

The same prophet foretells that sacrifice of the New Law which is committed to the hands of Christian priests.

"For from the rising of the sun even to its going down, My name is great among the Gentiles; and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to My name a clean oblation." (i., 11.)

The Hebrew word translated by *Thusia* in the Septuagint, and by *Oblatio* in the Latin Vulgate, is *Mincha*, the technical liturgical name of an Oblation of Bread and Wine. The *Mincha* was a type

of the Eucharist, and Malachi foretells the Eucharistic Sacrifice of the New Law, in which the species of bread and wine are the sacramental veils of the body and blood of Christ. So all the ancient interpreters explain it.

St. Justin Martyr: "And my friends," said I, "the oblation of wheaten flour, which was appointed to be offered for those who had been cleansed from leprosy, was a type of the Bread of the Eucharist which our Lord Jesus Christ commanded us to offer as a memorial of the passion which He endured in behalf of those men who have purified their souls from all sin; for which reason, as I said before, God speaks through Malachi, one of the twelve, concerning the sacrifices then offered by you. And He speaks beforehand, also, concerning the sacrifices offered to Him in every place by us Gentiles, to wit of the Bread of the Eucharist and likewise of the Eucharistic Chalice." (*Dial. cum Tryphon*, Sec. 41.) "As Jesus Christ our Saviour became incarnate and assumed both flesh and blood for our salvation, even so we believe that the food blessed by the word of prayer taught by Him, and by the reception of which our flesh and blood are nourished in the very Flesh and Blood of the same Incarnate Jesus." (*Apol. i.*, n. 66.)

St. Irenæus: "And giving counsel also to His disciples to offer the first fruits of His creatures to God, not as if He needed anything, but that they may not seem unfaithful and ungrateful, He took that which, as a creature, is bread, and gave thanks, saying, this is My Body. And likewise the chalice, which is of that material creation which is about us, He acknowledged to be His Own Blood, and taught the New Oblation of the New Testament, which the Church, receiving from the apostles, offers to God throughout the whole world, to Him who gives us for nourishment the first fruits of His gifts in the New Testament, of which in the book of the twelve prophets, Malachi then predicted, clearly signifying by these words that the former people shall indeed cease to offer to God, but that in every place a sacrifice shall be offered to God, and that a pure one." (*Adv. Haer.*, iv., 32.)

Theodoret: "Having predicted to the Jews in this manner the cessation of the legal priesthood, he foretells the Pure and Unbloody Sacrifice of the Gentiles. . . . And the slaughter of irrational animals has indeed come to an end, and the Spotless Lamb Who takes away the sins of the world is alone sacrificed, and fragrant incense is offered as a kind of symbol of virtue. (*Succinct. Interpret.*)

All the prophesies of the Old Testament respecting the kingdom of Christ on the earth, are, as it were, summed up in the prophet Daniel's exposition of the vision of Nebuchadnezzar. "Thus thou sawest, till a stone was cut out of a mountain without hands; and

it struck the statue upon the feet thereof, that were of iron and of clay, and brake them in pieces; . . . but the stone that struck the statue became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth. . . . But in the days of those kingdoms the God of heaven will set up a kingdom that shall never be destroyed; and His kingdom shall not be delivered up to another people; and it shall break in pieces and shall consume all these kingdoms; and itself shall stand forever." (Daniel, ii., 34, 35, 45.)

There is no prophecy in Holy Scripture whose general scope is more plain and indisputable than this. The great statue seen by the king in his vision represented secular imperial power in the heathen world in its successive phases, from the Assyrian to the Roman empire.

The little stone is the Christian religion. The force with which the little stone strikes the heathen world-empire is felt in the extremities of the Roman empire. A divine force, working for Christianity in the world, pulverizes and causes to evaporate and vanish the idolatrous, immoral, cruel heathenism, whose last great embodiment was the Roman empire. This is accomplished by the spreading of Christianity through and beyond the bounds of the Roman world, and by the weakening and overthrow of the empire of the Cæsars by the means of the barbarian and Saracenic invasions. It was not, however, political organization and government, as such, which were to be overthrown; for a renovated society was to succeed, a new civilization to be created, under the influence of the Christian religion.

Leaving aside for the present everything except the one dominant idea, a new kingdom springing from Judea as from a germ, and being a development of the royalty of David into the world-wide monarchy of his heir and successor, we see that the expectation of a grand Messianic empire which the Jews entertained with enthusiastic and unconquerable obstinacy, was essentially just and well founded, and only accidentally perverse.

Their expectation was perverse and erroneous, inasmuch as they had formed a low, narrow, and worldly conception of the nature of this kingdom, degrading it to the level of the Assyrian, Medo-Persian, Macedonian and Roman ideal of an universal empire, founded upon conquest by warfare, and upon physical force. It was also erroneous because they ascribed to their local and temporary religious law, a perpetuity and universality of which it was intrinsically incapable. They expected the perpetuity of the law of Moses, of the Levitical priesthood, of the temple and its sacrifices, all plainly impossible in a world-wide religion; and an extension of their spiritual and political power over all nations. They expected Jerusalem and Palestine to become the centre of the

world. They expected their Messiah to be a conquering warrior and monarch, under whom Jerusalem should take the place of Rome and hold all nations in subjection. Jesus Christ was not their ideal Messiah, and therefore they rejected Him, and compelled Pilate to crucify Him.

But they were not in error in believing that the Messiah was to be a king and found a kingdom. He was to be a king in a much higher sense than Moses and David, and to found a kingdom far surpassing the kingdom of Judah which was its type. The crown of thorns was really a diadem of universal dominion, the cross was a throne of glory and the inscription, "This is the King of the Jews," was literally true.

There may be a special and literal fulfilment of the splendid prophecies concerning Jerusalem and the Jewish people yet to come.

The angel who appeared to Daniel in the third year of Cyrus declared to him among many other things: "But at that time shall Michael rise up, the great prince who standeth for the children of thy people and a time shall come such as never was from the time that nations began even until that time. And at that time shall thy people be saved, every one that shall be found written in the book. . . . And I said to the man that was clothed in linen, that stood upon the waters of the river when he had lifted up his right hand and his left hand toward heaven and had sworn by Him that liveth forever, that it should be unto a time and times, and half a time (*i.e.*, three and a half years). . . . And from the time when the continual sacrifice shall be taken away and the abomination unto desolation shall be set up, there shall be a thousand two hundred ninety days. Happy is he that waiteth and cometh to a thousand three hundred thirty-five days." Dan. xii. 1, 7, 11, 12.)

The "time such as never was" need not be understood as an epoch of unexampled disaster, but may denote just the contrary. The mysterious thirteen hundred and thirty-fifth day is the date of some event which is the happy denouement of the great world-drama, the scene of which, if not heaven, must be this earth. If we may suppose that a final triumph of Jesus Christ and the Church at the last period of the world-history is foretold in connection with the conversion of the Jews, then it is reasonable to conclude that they will have a principal part in bringing it about, and that one part of this triumph will consist in the restoration of the people of God to Judea and Jerusalem, in the glory of the Holy Land and Holy City as one of the most illustrious seats of Christianity.

The author of the Second Book of the Machabees quotes from a lost book, "The Descriptions of the Prophet Jeremiah" a state-

ment that "the prophet, by a divine command which he received, ordered that the tabernacle and ark should accompany him, until he came to the mountain which Moses ascended and where he saw the inheritance of God. And Jeremiah, on arriving there, found in a certain place a cave; and he brought into it the tabernacle, the ark and the altar of incense, and shut up the entrance. And some of those who were following him came there together, that they might take note of the place, but were not able to find it. Now, when Jeremiah knew this, blaming them he said: *That the place shall be unknown, until God shall gather together the congregation of the people, and become propitious to them; and then the Lord will discover these things, and the majesty of the Lord will appear and there will be a cloud*, as it was shown to Moses, and as when Solomon petitioned that the place might be sanctified to the great God he showed these things." (2 Mach. i. 1-8.)

The inspired authority of this book is not acknowledged by Jews and Protestants, and therefore the passage cannot be cited in argument with them. The case can stand, however, without it, and it gives to Catholics a strong confirmation of the belief that an extraordinary act of divine grace is in reserve for the Jewish people in the last epoch of the world's history.

A clear and decisive prediction for all Christians of the final conversion of the Jews and of the effect which this event will produce among all other nations who will witness it, has been made by the Apostle St. Paul.

"I say then: Hath God cast away His people? God forbid. . . . I say then have they so stumbled that they should fall? ("fall away forever."—Kenrick). God forbid. But by their offence salvation is come to the Gentiles. . . . Now, if the offence of them be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles, how much more their fulness? . . . For if *the loss of them be the reconciliation of the world, what shall the receiving be but life from the dead?* . . . For if thou wast cut out of the natural wild olive tree, and, contrary to nature wast grafted into the good olive tree, how much more shall they, who are natural, be grafted into their own olive tree? For I would not have you ignorant, brethren, of this mystery (that you may not be wise in your own conceit), that blindness in part hath happened in Israel, until the fullness of the Gentiles come in, and so all Israel be saved, as it is written: (Is. lix. 20). Out of Sion shall come the Deliverer, and shall turn away impiety from Jacob." (Rom. xi.)

It is impossible for a Jew to interpret the prophecies in consistency with the rejection of Jesus Christ as the Messiah. Therefore, the majority of the most intelligent and best educated Israel-

ites have abandoned orthodox Judaism and have become advanced rationalists. Whatever special fulfilment of the prophecies may be yet to come, in a restoration of the Jewish people and of Jerusalem, it is conditioned on their conversion to Christianity. The main, grand scope of the prophecies relates to the Catholic Church and Christendom.

The fulfilment of the prophecies respecting Christ as a king, and His kingdom, must appear in history with a magnificence which leaves the Chaldean, Medo-Persian, Macedonian and Roman epochs far in the background and deep in the shade. The new Jerusalem, the new line of David, the new law, temple and priesthood, the new kingdom of the Messiah on the earth, must both resemble and surpass the old commonwealth and religion of Israel and the old Roman Empire. We must, therefore, look to the visible and historic Church and Christendom, which from small beginnings increases to colossal and world-wide dimensions, which fills all intellectual, moral and political space, and is identified with the grand, universal development of humanity, in order to find the true object of the prophecies. Those which relate to the king are utterly unintelligible without Jesus Christ; and those which relate to the kingdom are equally unmeaning without the Catholic Church.

When we turn from the Old Testament to the New, the prophetic light is focussed and concentrated upon the majestic figure of Christ the Lord in His holy temple, and the glorious edifice of the temple in which He is enthroned.

In respect to the person of the Messiah as soon as He is born, prophecy has already, in part, received its fulfilment, and has become history. Still, as He is only gradually manifested, and His glory is for the time hidden under the veil of humiliation, He speaks of Himself in a prophetic manner, and the gospels are greatly prophetic as well as historical. In respect to His kingdom, the Church, before the day of Pentecost and the beginning of the triumph of the Church over Judaism and Paganism, the prophetic element is still more predominant, the actual fulfilment of the predictions of the old prophets and of Christ Himself being, as yet, almost entirely in the future.

The prophecies of the Old Testament are, therefore, continued in the New, only with a distinct, explicit application to the person of Jesus Christ as the Messiah, and to the society of disciples which He organized as the nucleus and germ of His world-wide kingdom.

The angel Gabriel announced to Mary, respecting the son to be born of her: "He will be great, and will be called the Son of the Most High, and the Lord God will give Him the throne of David

His father; and He will reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of His kingdom there will be no end." (Luke i., 32, 33.)

When the Magi came from the East, they inquired of Herod: "Where is He that is born King of the Jews?" (Matt. ii., 2.) There was a general persuasion prevailing at that time, as Tacitus and Suetonius testify, that a king would arise out of Judea who would rule over the world. The Lord sent forth the twelve Apostles "to preach the kingdom of God." (Luke viii., 9.) In His parables, under the figure of a mustard-seed, from which sprang a great tree, and divers other figures, He taught lessons respecting the church He was founding. He said to the Apostles: "I assign to you, as My Father hath assigned to Me, a kingdom, that ye may eat and drink at My table in My kingdom, and sit upon thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." (Luke xxii., 29, 30.) The merited accusation which the rulers of the Jews made against Jesus before Pilate was, that He called Himself a king; wherefore Pilate ordered the title King of the Jews to be fastened at the top of His cross. After the resurrection, He gave His final instructions to the Apostles, "for forty days appearing to them and speaking of the kingdom of God." (Acts i., 3.) The disciples, whose minds always had been and still were full of the idea of the Messianic kingdom, asked Him: "Lord, wilt Thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" This was the last question they asked Him. In His answer, the last words He spoke on earth, He did not reprove them for supposing that His kingdom was about to be established, or even correct their erroneous notions about the nature of that kingdom. On the contrary, He implied that their expectation was essentially well founded, although their questions about the time and manner of its fulfilment were premature. "It is not for you to know the times or moments which the Father has set by His own power. But ye shall receive power when the Holy Spirit shall come upon you, and ye shall be witnesses to Me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and to the uttermost parts of the earth." (Luke i., 3-8.)

In the vast scope of all the prophecies concerning the royalty and kingdom of Jesus Christ, there is, doubtless, much which relates to the final and perfect consummation of the divine plan in the everlasting kingdom of heaven, which is the end and the fulfilment of all that is accomplished on the earth by the providence of God.

It is certain, however, that they relate, in part, to a specific exercise of royal power which is temporal in its nature and not identical with the universal and everlasting supremacy which belongs to our Lord in virtue of His divine Sonship. The kingdom, also, over which He rules as a temporal sovereign by a special temporal

mission in which the temporal mission of the Holy Spirit is included, is distinct from the realm of the universe, and from the consummated kingdom of heaven.

St. Paul explicitly teaches the distinction between the Messianic, Mediatorial reign of Christ, and the eternal kingdom which is His by inherent right as a Divine Person. "Then the end, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, when He shall have abolished all principality, and authority, and power. For He must reign until He put all enemies under His feet. And the enemy, death, shall be destroyed last, for He hath put all things under His feet. And when He saith, all things are put under Him, undoubtedly, except Him who put all things under Him. And when all things shall have been subjected to Him, then also the Son Himself will be subject to Him, who subjected all things to Him, that God may be all in all." (1 Cor., xv., 24-28.)

The temporal kingdom of Christ, without doubt, includes more than the Visible Church Militant on the earth. It extends to supermundane realms and beings in so far as these are related to the supernatural destiny of the human race. It embraces the administration of all the affairs of men and nations. It is an interior, intellectual, moral, and spiritual rule, as well as an exterior government. Its end is to carry on and complete the work of the glorification of elect angels and men until the day of the general resurrection and judgment, and the restitution of all things. The centre and principal seat of the operation of Christ is the Church on the earth. The significance of all human history lies in this operation of Christ. Before the appearance of the Son of God in human form on the earth, all events converge toward Him; after it, all diverge from Him. Before His human birth, all is a preparation for the Christendom which He founded; and all subsequent history is the development of Christianity until its final consummation. This is the kingdom of Christ. The Christian religion, together with all that proceeds from it, accompanies it, is subordinated to it, is conquered and brought into subjection by it, is made subservient to the final triumph of Christ; when the inspired declaration of St. Paul shall be fulfilled: "God hath highly exalted Him, and given Him the name which is above every name; that at the name of JESUS every knee should bend of the heavenly, earthly, and infernal beings, and every tongue should confess that the Lord JESUS CHRIST is in the glory (or to the glory) of God the Father." (Phillipp ii., 9-11.)

That the Church is the centre from which the royal power of Christ is exercised and his glory radiated through the whole universe, is most clearly declared by St. Paul in writing to the Ephesians.

"God hath put all things under His feet; and given Him to be head over all the Church, which is His body, and the fulness of Him who filleth all in all. . . . To me the least of all saints is this grace given, . . . to enlighten all, what is the dispensation of the mystery hidden during ages in God, . . . that the manifold wisdom of God may be known to the principalities and the powers in heavenly places *through the Church*." (Eph. i., 22, 23, iii., 8-10.)

The apostle teaches that Christ and the Church are related as the head and members which constitute a body. The members are the complement of the head. The Church is the *pleroma*, that which is filled by Him who filleth all, leaving no vacuum; which is as much as to say that it is the complement of the Incarnation.

The doctrine of the entire Epistle is summed up in the passages just quoted. The Epistle to the Ephesians is throughout an exposition of the Catholic idea of the Church as defined at the beginning of this article. The Church is represented under two figures, as the Spouse of Christ and as the Body of Christ. The apostle begins from the benediction and the adoption conferred by God, through Christ, upon those who believe. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has blessed us with every spiritual blessing in heavenly things in Christ, . . . having predestined us to the adoption of children through Jesus Christ to Himself." He proceeds to amplify his general statement by declaring that the full and final revelation and the complete dispensation of grace have been granted through Christ. "To make known to us the mystery of His will, according to his good pleasure, which He purposed in Him in the dispensation of the fulness of time to re-establish in the Christ all things which are in heaven, and which are in earth, in Him." This is a declaration that the divine revelation is completed in the Christian dispensation of grace which is final and universal, and will go on developing on its own line perpetually, through all ages, until the perfect restitution and consummation in the eternal kingdom of God. He then specifies the Church, as a Body through which, as a medium, Christ as its head conveys the plenitude of His power and grace, making it the complement of His Incarnation, the instrument by which He accomplishes the work of redemption. The passages in which this is explicitly stated have been quoted above. The figure, Body of Christ, evidently denotes that the Church of which St. Paul speaks is a visible, organized corporation, a society of men, the Church militant, over which Christ rules. The whole context shows that he is speaking of that Church which succeeded to the ecclesiastical kingdom of Judea, and over which the apostles

were placed as its chief rulers. Having declared that the Old Law was abrogated he affirms that believing Jews and Gentiles have been made fellow-citizens of a new holy State. "For He is our peace who hath made both one, . . . making void the laws of commandments in decrees, that He may make in Himself two into one new man, making peace, and may reconcile both *in one body*, to God by the cross. . . . Ye are fellow-citizens of the saints and of the household of God, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, the chief corner-stone being Christ Jesus Himself, in whom all the building framed together groweth into a holy temple in the Lord."

The whole Christian religion is therefore embodied in the Church as a corporate, organic unity. All the privileges and duties of a Christian are summed up in his being a living member of this one Body of Christ, through which he participates in the grace which is diffused from the head into the members. "I, therefore, the prisoner in the Lord, beseech you to walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. One body and one spirit, as ye are called in one hope of your calling. One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all." The body is that society which is governed by apostles and apostolic pastors. "And He gave some indeed apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and others pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints for the work of the ministry, for the building up of the body of Christ." From this Body, through this apostolic ministration, *i.e.*, in the Church and by the word and sacraments, the faithful receive the grace of Christ, in order to become perfect Christians. "That . . . we may grow in all things in him who is the head, Christ; from whom the whole body, fitted together and connected by every joint which supplieth, according to the operation in the measure of each member, maketh the increase of the body to the building of itself in love." (Eph. i-iv.)

There could not be a more explicit declaration of the Catholic doctrine of the Church, as opposed to the Protestant doctrine, namely, of the substantial identity of the visible and invisible Church, the strict union of its soul and body. The Church as a visible body, animated by the spirit of faith, hope and charity, vitally united to Christ and filled by the Holy Spirit, is clearly set forth as the medium of justification, sanctification and salvation, to individual believers. It is this compact, closely connected, organic body, in which is the subministration of grace according to a measure, *i.e.*, a hierarchical order, of whose life individuals partake by their union with it. St. Paul still further exalts its prerogative by calling it the Spouse of Christ. "Christ hath loved the Church

and delivered Himself up for it, that He might sanctify it, cleansing it with the laver of water in the Word. That He Himself might present to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it may be holy and without blemish." (Eph. v., 25-26.) Here we have the note of sanctity. The notes of unity and apostolicity have been expressed above. The note of Catholicity, implicitly contained in the other notes, is explicitly expressed in another sentence. "To Him be glory *in the Church*, and in Christ Jesus *for all generations, world without end.*" (Eph. iii., 21.)

The dogma of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church is clearly shown to have been placed by the apostle on the same level with the dogmas of the unity of God, the redemption of Christ and the verity of the divine revelation of the Holy Spirit. "One God, one Lord, one Spirit, one Faith, one Body."

Thus we have the Holy Scripture explaining its own prophecies concerning the Messiah as king and His kingdom, the city of God, which is the Catholic Church. The Catholic idea in prophecy is set forth in the clearest light by an inspired interpretation.

In the Apocalypse of St. John all the splendor of the prophets is renewed and surpassed. The Lord appears in His royal glory, and by his side, the Church, His spouse and queen, in this last illuminated scroll of prophecy.

"Grace to you and peace from Him who is and who was, and who is to come, . . . and from Jesus Christ . . . the prince of the kings of the earth, who hath made us a kingdom and priests to His God and Father. . . . And immediately I was in spirit, and behold a throne was set in heaven, and on the throne one was sitting. And He who sat was like in sight to a jasper and sardine stone, and a rainbow was around the throne in sight like an emerald. And round about the throne were twenty-four thrones, and on the thrones twenty-four ancients were sitting (the number of the apostolic college doubled to signify the entire Catholic episcopate) clothed with white robes and having golden crowns on their heads. . . . And one of the seven angels came and spoke with me, saying: Come and I will show thee the bride, the wife of the lamb. And he took me up in spirit to a great and high mountain, and he showed me the holy city of Jerusalem coming down out of heaven from God. . . . And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them twelve names of the twelve apostles of the lamb. . . . And the city hath no need of the sun or the moon to shine in it, for the glory of God brighteneth it, and the lamb is its lamp. And the nations shall walk in its light, and the kings of the earth shall bring their glory and honor into it." (Apoc., i., iv., xxi.) This is a description of the Church triumphant in heaven. But the Church triumphant is the Church militant

brought to its perfection. The kingdom of Christ on earth is the beginning of the eternal kingdom, and possesses the same qualities in the inchoate state. Wherefore, our Lord and the sacred writers frequently blend them together and pass from one to the other in the same discourse.

In all the prophecies which have been cited, and in many others, the Church, as the city of God, is described as founded by Jesus Christ and his apostles, as continuing through all time, extending and developing with an ever increasing splendor on the earth, and finally transformed into the glorious kingdom of heaven.

The fulfilment of prophecy must be looked for in history. Those historical facts which correspond to the predictions of inspired prophets must be what they foresaw and foretold. Historical Christianity, subsisting unchanged in unbroken continuity from the mission of the apostles, must be the genuine Christianity. The historical church is the Catholic Church. This Church alone presents a historical correspondence to the prophecies of Holy Scripture, and exhibits a kingdom of Christ fulfilling their magnificent predictions.

What is ecclesiastical history, the history of Christendom and Christian civilization with the Catholic Church left out? A mere record of mutually hostile sects, dividing and disintegrating more and more, and each one having in itself a principle of decay and dissolution. Until the epoch of the Lutheran revolt the principal sects which are schismatical or heretical have no affinity with Protestantism, but are witnesses against its principles and doctrines. The Protestant idea has no place in the history of ancient Christianity. Protestant writers on ecclesiastical history are obliged to make the Catholic Church during the first fifteen centuries their principal topic. At the earliest period in which the Church and Christianity manifest clearly and distinctly their form and lineaments, it is the Catholic idea which is embodied in the universal organic Christian commonwealth.

There are only three hypotheses which can be adopted in explanation of this fact, by one who acknowledges the divinity of Christ and the divine origin of Christianity. One is, that primitive Christianity was altered by corruption soon after the apostolic age, so that Catholicism is a pseudo-Christianity, a colossal fraud, a Satanic and anti-Christian religion. Another is, that Christ left his religion to be organized and developed in a human mode by the apostles and their successors, who built upon the foundation which Christ laid the superstructure of the Catholic Church. The third, which must be unavoidably adopted, if the other two are proved to be false and incredible, is, that the Catholic Church is a divine institution, founded by Jesus Christ through His apostles; and Catholic Christianity, the genuine, primitive, original Christian

religion. These may be called the diabolical, the human and the divine hypotheses. The first is derived from that system of theology which teaches that God loves only a small number out of the whole human race, who alone have been redeemed by Christ, and who are saved by an irresistible grace which enlightens and sanctifies each one individually by an immediate action of the Holy Spirit upon him. The rest of mankind are objects of divine hatred and vengeance, doomed irrevocably to sin and the burning lake by a decree preceding their birth. According to this doctrine, the kingdom of Satan is universal, with the sole exception of the invisible church of the elect. But, as even those sects which have most deliberately and obstinately professed the doctrines of Calvinism are casting them off with horror and disgust, and the vast body of non-Catholics have no sympathy with them, it is useless to discuss the diabolical hypothesis.

The human hypothesis is the one which finds favor with Protestants who cultivate theology, philosophy and history in a liberal and scholarly spirit. It is, however, equally untenable with the other, and much more illogical and self-contradictory. For it assumes, that as a human institution, the Catholic Church is grand and good and beneficent. Yet, if it is merely human, and not divine, it is all founded on illusion, error and imposture, and the first hypothesis is the true one. If it is grand and good and beneficent, it must be divine. If the Lord really left the organization of the Church to be constructed and developed in a human mode, like a civil commonwealth, He must have given instructions to the apostles in accordance with His intentions. He must have taught them fully and clearly what was the substance and essence of the Christian religion. They must have understood this teaching, and acted faithfully in accordance with it. They must have taught their disciples the same doctrine, and the primitive Church must have fully imbibed it. A conscious or an unconscious alteration of genuine, primitive Christianity could not possibly have taken place among sincere, enlightened and devout Christians. But the whole system of Catholicism, in doctrine, discipline and ritual, as we find it in possession at the time of the First Council of Nicæa, was either the genuine and divine Christian religion or an essential alteration of the same. The Catholic Church has always, from the first, claimed to be divine, and as such has demanded submission and obedience to her teaching, authority and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. If this claim is not founded on the mission of Jesus Christ, it is an usurpation, and Catholicism, like Mohammedanism, is a colossal fraud, a vast conspiracy against Christian liberty.

There is a perfect parallel here between the claim of the Catholic Church to divine authority and the claim of Jesus Christ to divine personality.

One of the most powerful and persuasive arguments for the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ is that which is derived from the super-eminent excellence and sanctity of His human character. He shines among the saints and sages of the world with a radiant light of moral beauty and splendor which extinguishes their united lustre, as the ascending sun puts out the stars of the sky. He is the perfect type and model of all the human virtues, without a flaw of imperfection. But he distinctly and emphatically claims to be the Son of God, equal to the Father, and one in essence with Him. If He made this claim in good faith from a hallucination of the imagination, or in bad faith by a deliberate usurpation, He was not the noblest and best of men, but far otherwise. The supposition is an absurdity. It is impossible to detract from his surpassing intellectual and moral perfection, to which the homage of mankind is given by the irresistible attraction which draws with magnetic force all minds and hearts to Himself. Therefore, because He is holy, He is divine.

It is the same with the Catholic Church. She is what she has always professed to be, divine, or else an evil work of hallucination and fraud.

This, also, is a *reductio ad absurdum*. In like manner as we can bring forward abundant and glowing tributes to the moral beauty of the character of Jesus Christ from those who have refused to give Him divine worship, or even to profess to be his disciples, so we can cite the confessions of all kinds of non-Catholics of the splendor and beneficent influence of the Catholic Church as a regenerating and sanctifying power in the world.

It is impossible to make even a plausible defence of the thesis that Jesus Christ is the divine Saviour, Regenerator, and King of the world, without recognizing in historical Christianity His Church, His religion, His kingdom. But historical Christianity is the substance and essence of the religion of Christ embodied in the Catholic Church. All intelligent and learned Protestants who have a theological, philosophical, and historical spirit and sense, are obliged to find some reason for placing themselves in sympathy with the Catholic Church of past ages, and identifying their cause with that of historical Christianity. They seek for a loophole of escape from the conclusion that they are logically and morally bound to be Catholics, and for a plea in justification of their so-called Reformation without abjuring and condemning ancient Christianity. But their effort is vain. Their admissions cannot be justified, and historical Christianity, from its earliest clear and unmistakable manifestation, cannot be accounted for, on Christian principles especially, unless it be conceded that the Catholic Church in faith, organization, and sacramental rites, is of divine origin from Christ through the Apostles, having a perpetual authority obliga-

tory on all men in all times. As Christians, they are logically and morally bound to be Catholics; they belong with us, and are inconsistent while they remain members of a sect. If they follow their better and sounder principles and tendencies, they will eventually join our ranks. Their anti-Catholic opinions and tendencies, on the contrary, logically lead to the abyss of pure rationalism, into which they must inevitably fall unless they return to the Catholic Church which their forefathers abandoned.

The fulfilment of the prophecies concerning the kingdom of Christ cannot be found anywhere except in historical Christianity and in the Catholic Church.

The kingdom of Christ is not, however, precisely and exclusively coincident with the exercise of ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction. He is king over all nations, and governs them with a view to the welfare of all mankind. The best and noblest part of His kingdom is interior, within the souls of men. Wherever there is truth and virtue, there is a part of this interior kingdom. Every soul in which faith, hope, and charity reside is united to the soul of the Church by the Holy Spirit in an invisible manner. Wherever there are sacraments among schismatical sects, there exists a partial and imperfect union with the Church which is external and visible, and, if there is no obstacle of a resisting will in the recipient, there is also a perfect interior union with the soul of the Church. Whatever is done in work and warfare against sin and vice for the sanctification of souls and the glory of God, is done in the service of Jesus Christ and in the spirit of the Church. It is an axiom that *extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus*. Therefore, wherever there is *Salus*, it is *intra Ecclesiam*. The Church is coeval with the human race. It embraces all who have faith and the love of God. All that has been done in the sects against the kingdom of Satan and for the kingdom of Christ; all the truth, goodness, and Christianity in them, belongs to the Catholic Church, just as their baptized infants are made by baptism children of the Church, and not members of a sect. Heresy and schism have never given any life; they are deadly. Life is from the Holy Spirit, who animates the Catholic Church and who diffuses His grace beyond the bounds of its visible communion everywhere through the universal world. The influence of this divine grace, unless impeded by sin or ignorance, draws all men to the true Church. The prophecies of Holy Scripture foretell this flocking of multitudes, like doves to their windows, to the city and home of God, the New Jerusalem. They have been fulfilled in a certain large measure already. But we may hope that they will be more fully accomplished in the future by the healing of the schisms of Christendom and the conversion of the pagan nations.

AUGUSTINE F. HEWIT.

BEATRICE AND OTHER ALLEGORICAL CHARACTERS OF DANTE ALIGHIERI.

THE recent celebration in Italy of the six hundredth anniversary of the death of Beatrice (which is supposed to have occurred June 9, 1290), if it may be called a celebration, had this good effect, that it gave a new impulse to the study of the master-poet of the middle ages, and probably of all times; and particularly that it called forth new works which have thrown fresh light upon that mysterious figure that was the inspiring genius of all the poet's works—light which, in our judgment, will, finally, bring out her true character beyond serious doubt. Among those who, on this occasion, have written on Beatrice, says the *Edinburgh Review* (July, 1891), "the most recent, and, in some respects, the most hardy and thorough in his interpretation on points of detail, among the advocates of the 'symbolical' theory, is Gietmann, a member of the Society of Jesus, whose views are set forth in a work recently published entitled, 'Beatrice, Geist und Kern der Dante'shen Dichtung.'"

We could hardly expect the writer in the *Edinburgh Review*, consistently with the traditions of that magazine, to appreciate the masterly argument of Father Gietmann, as did some of the most ably conducted Protestant and anti-Catholic literary reviews of the continent of Europe.¹ While, therefore, we wait to hear from Father Gietmann himself on the strictures of the *Edinburgh Review*, we shall, in this paper, confine ourselves to a brief statement of the chief points of Father Gietmann's argument for the symbolic character of Beatrice.²

The critical appreciation of Dante's "Divina Comedia," as well as of his minor poetic productions, the "Vita Nuova," and the "Convito," will depend, in great part, on the view that is taken of Beatrice. She is the soul and centre of the poet's works, his inspiring genius, the ideal which moulds his life and character. If we consider her as a mere historical personage, we must look

¹ The *Literarische Unterhaltung*, in Germany; the *Dietsche Waraude*, in Holland (both Protestant, and noted Dantists); and the *Giornale Storico*, in Italy (anti clerical), have bestowed the highest and most unqualified praise on Gietmann's *Beatrice*.

² Besides the poet's original works, and Father Gietmann's *Beatrice* (Freiburg, 1889), we acknowledge our indebtedness also to the same author's work, entitled, *Die Göttliche Comödie und ihr Dichter Dante Alighieri* (Freiburg, 1885), and to the translations of the *Vita Nuova* by Norton, of the *Convito* by Miss Hillard, and of the *Divina Comedia* by Longfellow; all of which we have freely used in preparing this paper. ❧

upon those works as silly and meaningless romances, and on the poet himself as a drivelling day-dreamer. But if we are able to assign to Dante's beloved an appropriate and consistent allegorical character, in keeping with the views of the poet's time, with the peculiar bent of his mind, and with the quality of the varied material which goes to build up his poetic structures, his creations will appear not only intelligible and natural, but unfold a treasure of thought and beauty nowhere else to be found; while the poet himself will be shown to be not only one of the greatest masters of thought and imagination, but one of the noblest and loftiest minds to be met with in the history of letters.

The "Vita Nuova," and "Convito," are juvenile productions of the poet, and, as it were, the stepping-stones to the "Divina Comedia"; while the latter is, in fact, the embodiment and complete development of the ideas brought out in both the other works, as they had grown and taken shape in the poet's mind in the lapse of years.

The "Vita Nuova" (new life, or, more properly, life's spring-time), in outward form consists of a simple autobiographical narrative, in prose form, interspersed with thirty-one sonnets and canzoni, most of which have direct or indirect reference to Beatrice. It bears an erotic character, like most poetic compositions of the times. It describes, now in prose, now in rhyme, the poet's first meeting with Beatrice, at which the flame of love was enkindled in his breast; the various phases of his passion, the death of Beatrice, and his intense grief at her demise; which, however, is partially relieved by the sympathies of *another gentildonna*, whose kind attentions gradually divert his mind from his first love. This disloyalty he makes the subject of bitter self-reproach, and returns in repentance to his first affection. He suddenly breaks off his work to devote himself for some years to study, thus to fit himself to write, in strains more worthy of his beloved, "what never yet was said of woman"—doubtless the "Divina Comedia," which was to be the crowning work of his life.

It was while paying his addresses to his second love that he wrote his "Convito" (banquet, a title probably suggested by Plato's symposion), of a philosophical character, purporting to be a comment on fourteen canzoni in praise of the second gentildonna, but discontinued by the poet after the exposition of the third canzone, to devote the remainder of his life to the design and execution of the *grand canzone*, which was destined to be an undying monument to his Beatrice.

From this bare statement it must be evident to the reader that it is the same Beatrice that figures in the "Vita Nuova," and in the "Comedia," and indirectly, also, in the "Convito." She is the

dream of the poet's life, the goal of his literary aspirations, his bliss in life, his hope in death. If, therefore, the "Vita Nuova" is a mere romance, the "Comedia" is no more than a romance—a romance, all the more ridiculous and absurd, the more elaborate is its structure, the more sublime its character, and the more exquisite its erudition. If, on the other hand, we give Beatrice an allegorical part in the "Comedia," we must do so, likewise, in the "Vita Nuova," since she is absolutely identical in both works.

The poet's first encounter with Beatrice is described in such a way as unmistakably to show that she is something more than human. She had entered upon her ninth year, while the poet had nearly completed that age. She was called Beatrice (*i.e.*, bliss-bestowing) by many who knew not the reason why. She appeared to him "clothed in most noble color, modest and becoming crimson." At that moment his heart trembled within him, and he exclaimed, "*Ecce deus fortior me; qui veniens dominabitur mihi*;" while the intellectual spirit marvelled and said, *Apparuit beatitudo vestra*." From that moment, love held sway over his heart, whence he often sought her, and she appeared to him, in the words of Homer, "not the daughter of mortal men, but of the gods." He further refrains from narrating the actions and passions of this youthful stage of life, "lest he should seem to tell an idle tale."

Whatever we may think of the possibility of such an early flame in the poet's heart, we must admit that this description of his first meeting with Beatrice is marked with the character of the allegorical and unreal: which naturally leads us to look upon Beatrice as a superhuman being. The same conclusion is forced upon us by the solemn manner in which the narrative is introduced with mystic circumstances, and the symbolic number *nine*, which plays such an important part in the narrative.

His subsequent relation to Beatrice presents the same unreal, unearthly character. It is altogether improbable that she who was nearly of the same age as himself, living in the same city, the sister of an intimate friend and "nearest in kin but one"—she whom he loved so ardently and sought so eagerly should for full nine years after this first encounter not meet his gaze, and then only to greet him in the street with a passing smile. Another glimpse of the object of his bliss (*la mia beatitudine*) is granted him after a long interval—this time in a church, where the praises of the Queen of Glory were being celebrated. He gazed at her athwart another gentle lady, who was falsely taken by the bystanders to be the object of his passion. And this he also feigned to be the case for some months and years, to divert the attention of the multitude from the real object of his love. This other donna, in the holy place, who stands between him and Beatrice,

and is, as it were, the medium of their communication (he calls her the lady of the screen) is manifestly a creation that is in the closest relation with his beloved.

But he gives his Beatrice a still larger following of noble ladies. At this time he weaves into one poetic garland the names of sixty fair and noble ladies; and among these he gives Beatrice again the ninth place. Why the ninth place? Because, he says, she is *the nine*—her root is the Blessed Trinity ($\sqrt[3]{9} = 3$). But, why does he choose the number *sixty*? Apparently to personate the sixty queens of Solomon, who sang in the Canticle of Canticles: "There are *threescore queens* *One* is my dove; my perfect one is but *one*; . . . the daughters saw her and declared her most *blessed*" (Cant. vi. 7). Who Solomon's *one*, *perfect*, and *blessed* spouse is we shall have occasion to show later on. Here we shall only ask: Is this possibly the development of romance? If so, it is a romance of peculiar character, rather the production of a raving maniac than of a poet.

If we consider the poems that have been indited to her praise at this time, we must come to the same conclusion. Her praises are not to be sung for all, but only for the few, who understand them. Therefore he addresses his most pathetic canzone in her praise to those "ladies who have intelligence of love" (*Donne, ch'avete intelletto d'amore*), to those "who are more than women." In this poem she is described as the marvellous image of the Most High; the glorious rays of her splendor penetrate to heaven; she is the object of the admiration, delight, and longing of the blessed spirits. She is the source of virtue and the pledge of salvation, and

"God hath given her this greater grace:
Who saw, and spoke with her cannot be lost."

Such is not the language of earthly love. It is in the *death of Beatrice*, however, that the symbolism is most prominently brought out; and it is the description of her death that gives the clue to the meaning of the allegory. The chapter treating of her death opens with the text of Jeremias (Lament, i. 1) "*Quomodo sedet civitas*—how doth the city sit solitary that was full of people! How is the mistress of the gentiles become as a widow!" It is preceded by the description of the death of Beatrice's father, and her grief at his taking off, which foreshadows, as it were, her own death. The poet stands aloof on both occasions, and indulges silent grief. He even refrains from describing Beatrice's death, for the following reasons: First, because this does not belong to the design of the book (this portion being, doubtless, a subsequent addition); secondly, because his pen is inadequate to such a task; thirdly,

because it were unbecoming in him to attempt a description of her death; for in so doing he would be forced to praise himself—"a thing reprehensible in him who doth it." He, therefore, refrains from giving further particulars of her death. But he gives an elaborate exposition of the symbolic meaning of the date of her death, in which the mystic number *nine* again plays its usual allegorical role. This number, which figures so prominently in the life and death of his beloved, he declares, is Beatrice herself; for "*she was a miracle, whose only root was the marvellous Trinity.*"

"At Beatrice's death," continues the poet, "the aforesaid city was despoiled of every dignity; wherefore I, still weeping in this desolate city, wrote to the *princes of the earth*, somewhat in this condition, taking that beginning of Jeremias: *Quomodo sedet civitas!* This letter to the princes of the earth is that addressed to the Cardinals, 1313, when these were assembled in conclave, after the death of Clement V., for the election of a successor. To this letter we shall have occasion to return. Here we shall only ask the reader whether there is any likelihood that the poet would thus treat the death of the daughter of Folco Portinari, the wife of Simon Bardi? Is she that mystic *nine* which the heavens themselves have conspired to produce, whose only root is the Undivided Trinity? Is it on her account that the city is desolate and widowed? Is her death a public calamity of such magnitude? Is it likely to inspire the text for an epistle to the princes of the earth? It requires a more than human stretch of imagination to make such an elaborate structure of mystic imagery tally with the very ordinary circumstances of the demise of a Florentine woman, of whom history knows nothing.

After the death of his beloved, the poet abandons himself entirely to grief, but is soon partially consoled by another gentildonna, who attracts his attention shortly after the anniversary of Beatrice's death. She wins him by her compassion; he gradually begins to forget his sorrow; for which he subsequently reproaches himself bitterly. His heart turns wholly to her, while his reason rebukes it, until at length his gentle Beatrice appears to him in a vision at the hour of *none* (the ninth hour), and rebukes him for his disloyalty, whence he returns to his first love.

Who this second mistress of his affections is he plainly sets forth in the "Convito," fearing, as he says, "the infamy of being held subject to such passion as those who read his canzoni might consider him possessed of"; else his poems could not be understood, "because *they are hidden under the figures of an allegory* (B. i. c. 2). In his grief at Beatrice's death he began to read the works of Boëthius and Cicero; whence he sought and found "a remedy for his tears." He soon discovered that *philosophy* was the mistress of

these authors. "I imagined her [philosophy]," he says, "as a noble lady; and I could not imagine her otherwise than merciful; wherefore so willingly did my thoughts dwell upon her, that they could scarcely be diverted from her. And on account of this imagination I began to go where in truth she showed herself, that is, in the schools of the religious, and the disputations of the philosophers; so that in a little while, perhaps thirty months, I began to be so deeply aware of her sweetness that the love of her banished every other thought" (B. ii. 16). In another passage, he writes: "I say and affirm that the lady of whom I was enamored, after my first love, was the most beautiful and most virtuous daughter of the universe, to whom Pythagoras gave the name of *Philosophy* (B. ii. 16).

Now if, in the poet's own words, the second donna is an allegorical character personating philosophy, must we not conclude that Beatrice who is still more aerial and spiritual is likewise an allegorical personage? If the poet's own words forbid us to interpret this second donna as Gemma Donati, Dante's wedded wife, how can we consider Beatrice as Dante's mistress? We see, then, that Beatrice, who is the source of the poet's inspiration in the "Vita Nuova" and the mainspring of his entire intellectual and literary life, has not a trace of earthliness about her and that to be duly appreciated she must be regarded as *an allegorical creation*.

While engaged in these philosophical studies and in the composition of the "Convito," Dante received the inspiration of the "Divinia Comedia," which is to be a *grand canzone* in praise of Beatrice. The poet himself records the fact in this wise in the concluding paragraph or postscript to the "Vita Nuova:" "A wonderful vision appeared to me in which I saw things that made me resolve to speak no more of this *blessed one*, until I could more worthily treat of her. And to attain to this, I study to the utmost of my power, as she well knoweth; so that, if it shall please Him through whom all things live, that my life shall be prolonged for some years, I hope to say of her *what was never said of any woman*. And then may it please Him who is Lord of grace, that my soul may go to behold the glory of its lady, namely, of the blessed Beatrice, who in glory looketh upon the face of Him, *qui est per omnia secula benedictus*."

The "Divina Comedia" is, therefore, a grand canticle of praise on the object of his life-long affection. It is the outgrowth of the "Vita Nuova" and the "Convito," the embodiment of his life's thought, the full presentment of that ideal which stood in bold relief before his mind from early childhood. To this ideal all his thoughts and studies, all the then known literature, arts and sciences were made subservient. Is this ideal the Florentine's

daughter? If so, we must take the poet to be the wildest visionary and his work to be the most maudlin specimen of sentimental nonsense to be met with in literature. For the man who will regard Dante's "*Divina Comedia*" as a mere romantic dream there is no cure.

Non ragioniam di lui; ma guarda e passa.

Taking the "*Vita Nuova* and the "*Convito*," therefore, without note or comment, the conviction which necessarily grows upon us is, that Beatrice is wholly and solely an *allegorical figure*.

Nor has history anything to oppose to this interpretation of Dante's beloved. True, Boccaccio has built up a romance on the data of the "*Vita Nuova*." He pretends to have found one Beatrice, Folco Portuiani's daughter, subsequently the wife of Simon Bardi, of Florence, whom he makes the theme of Dante's song; but, whoever knows the character of the Tuscan *novellista* will give little historical importance to this narrative. A few early commentators follow him; but there is no more credence due to them than to the inventor of the fable. And though the historical Beatrice might be identified and Dante's love could be proved, yet the intrinsic evidence that the Beatrice of the "*Vita Nuova*," and, consequently, also of the "*Comedia*," is an allegorical personage, would thereby be in naught weakened. At most, it might be conjectured that she suggested the name.

The oldest and best commentators know absolutely nothing of Portuiani's daughter; Francesco da Berti, who occupied the Dante chair at the university of Padua and completed his commentary before 1385, flatly denies the reality of Beatrice. "One might be led to think," he says, "that Beatrice was a maid of flesh and bone (*di carne ed ossa*); but this is not the case." Pietro Dante, who is commonly supposed to have been the poet's son, nowhere gives Beatrice any other than an allegorical rôle, even when commenting on "the fair limbs wherein her spirit was enshrined." In like manner, Jacopo della Lana, who is supposed to have been the first commentator in point of time, and the "*Commento Ottimo*," which is certainly one of the earliest interpretations. The latter calls the literal interpretation "a secular exposition according to the outward surface." We may add that even those who put faith in Boccaccio's yarn generally admit that Beatrice, in the "*Divina Comedia*," at least, plays a part *chiefly* allegorical. Thus Rambaldi da Imola: "Dante, it seems to me, takes Beatrice sometimes historically, but oftener *anagogically* (*i.e.*, allegorically) for Theology."

Nor does it weaken our evidence that Beatrice is delineated with much individuality by the poet. Individualism is one of the poetic

requirements of the allegory. We need only recall Longfellow's *Building of the Ship*, or Schiller's *Glocke*, in both of which we find descriptions more detailed and realistic than anything to be met with in Dante's poems regarding Beatrice. And yet no one will deny that these poems are allegorical.

That Dante's beloved plays a part, at least, *chiefly* allegorical, is admitted by the best critics of ancient and modern times, while the merely historical character is defended only by romancers, realists, naturalists and sensualists. But, if she is chiefly allegorical, why not altogether? Why make her change her character at the caprice of the critic? This is, at best, a cheap way to solve a difficulty. But to us it is inconceivable how a writing or document can have more than one meaning intended by its author. The assumption of a plurality of meanings intended by an author is arbitrary, if not absurd; and, instead of clearing up difficulties, it only wraps an author's meaning in impenetrable darkness.

From what we have thus far said, we think it may be gathered with sufficient certainty that, on the one hand, there is no evidence that Dante's Beatrice is an historical character, and that, on the other hand, there is the strongest intrinsic evidence that from the beginning to the end of the work she plays an exclusively allegorical part.

Having said thus much to establish the allegorical character of Beatrice, we shall now proceed to give some hints towards the *understanding of the allegory itself*. Our explanation, to which we would attribute no more than a strong probability (which, however, is amply sufficient in a literary problem like the present, will prove new to most of our readers, but will, we trust, none the less, on the evidence which we shall produce, commend itself to their acceptance. It has been proposed for the first time, to our knowledge, by the Rev. Father Gietmann, upon whose valuable researches this paper is chiefly based. It is not, however, so much a negation of, as a complement to, former interpretations by the greatest critics and commentators.

According to the more common interpretation of those who advocate the allegorical meaning, Beatrice in the "Vita Nuova" and the "Divina Comedia" symbolizes theology or the teaching of revelation as opposed to philosophy, or the teaching of reason. Rational science is represented in the "Convito" by that compassionate donna "whom Pythagoras called by the name of Philosophy," and in the "Comedia" by "Virgil," who is the poet's guide through the realms of hell and purgatory. The reason why Dante chose Virgil for his guide in the "Divina Comedia" was, probably, because his was a poetic pilgrimage, on which he had to be guided by the genius of poetry as well as of philosophy, both

of which were amply represented in the Roman poet. Besides, it can hardly be doubted that he borrowed, to some extent, the inspiration of the "Inferno" and "Purgatorio" from Virgil—not merely "the beautiful style that had done him honor." As far as mere human reason and knowledge could reach, Virgil served as his pilot, but always in the service of Beatrice, by whom he had been sent, and to whom he had to lead his charge. In the higher regions of light Beatrice alone can guide his footsteps. She might, therefore, be aptly considered as the representative of the science of theology or revelation. However, it is hard to understand how sacred science, as such, could exercise so powerful an influence on the poet's mind and heart at the early age of nine years, and produce such an ecstasy of love towards herself as described in his first meeting with Beatrice.

Others interpret Beatrice as that blissful supernatural wisdom, or *blessedness in God*, which the just and sanctified soul enjoys even in this life. She has also been identified with *infused grace*, habitual or actual; and some have considered her as the personification of the *grace of enlightenment* in particular. But, although these several opinions seem to be well grounded in portions of the "Divina Comedia" yet they do not suffice to explain the manifold influences of Dante's beloved. Scartazzini, one of the most recent exponents of Dante's thought, maintains that Beatrice represents the supreme authority in spiritual matters, or *the ideal Papacy*. Yet even this interpretation seems to be rather narrow, to take in the various functions assigned to Beatrice.

We must, therefore, seek an explanation which will comprise all those manifold functions taken together; and the only equivalent we can find is *the Church herself*, the spouse of Christ, taken in her entirety and in her ideal perfection, in all her supernatural beauty and holiness, as she proceeded without spot or wrinkle from the hands of her divine founder. She alone embraces all those various functions attributed to the poet's beloved. She is the infallible teacher of revelation, of sacred science, the saving science of the saints; she is the God-appointed dispenser of divine grace, and the supreme spiritual and supernatural authority or guide of men to their last end. Therefore we say that the Church, and the Church alone, possesses and exercises those manifold functions and influences attributed to Dante's beloved. Our theory of Beatrice has, therefore, at least the two necessary attributes of a plausible hypothesis—*requiritur et sufficit*. It is necessary, and at the same time sufficient, to explain her part.

We would not, however, have our opinion considered as a *mere hypothesis*, or theory of mere convenience, without any positive proof; for we have strong evidence in Dante's own works to sup-

port our views. In discussing the "*Vita Nuova*," we referred at some length to a letter which the poet wrote to the cardinals in 1313. This letter was written after the death of Beatrice, and under the pressure of grief caused by this sad event. It bears the same heading as the chapter in the "*Vita Nuova*," which treats of Beatrice's death: *Quomodo sedet civitas*, etc. In the symbolic description of Beatrice's death, in the "*Vita Nuova*," he clearly hints that the letter to the cardinals treats of the same matter; whence, he says, he began with the same words of the prophet Jeremias. But in the letter to the cardinals there is no mistaking the poet's meaning. Here he evidently means the Church, the spouse of Christ, whom he describes as dead, while he himself is the only one who stands, as it were, mourning at her bier (in *matris ecclesiæ quasi funere*). In this epistle he designates the Church no less than four different times as the spouse of Christ. "O mother, full of gentleness and pity," he exclaims; "O *spouse of Christ*, what manner of children hast thou, by water and the spirit brought forth to thy shame." This is the Beatrice, the blissful one, whose death he mourns, and at whose bier he alone raises his voice; whence we may also understand why he says in the "*Vita Nuova*," that he could not describe her death without praising himself.

The idea of the Church as the spouse of Christ is scriptural. It is fully brought out by St. Paul (Eph. v., 23-27), where he says: "Husbands, love your wives as Christ also loved His Church, and delivered Himself up for it . . . that He might present it to Himself as a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle; . . . but that it might be holy and without blemish." The same relation between Christ and His Church, according to the most common interpretation, is described in the canticle of Solomon. This was also the interpretation of our poet, as we learn from the "*Convito*" (B. II. 6), where he tells us that it is of the spouse of the Saviour, the holy Church, that Solomon says (Cant. 8, 5): "Who is this that cometh up from the wilderness, full of delights, leaning upon her beloved?" It is this glorious and immaculate spouse, whose death the poet mourns in the epistle to the cardinals; it is the same whom he bewails in the death of Beatrice in the "*Vita Nuova*"; it is the same whom he finds again, and who is described in the last cantos of the "*Purgatorio*" as born in triumph upon that glorious chariot representing the Church visible upon earth.

"A chariot triumphal on two wheels,
Which by a griffin's neck came drawn along.
Not only Rome with no such splendid car
E'er gladdened Africanus or Augustus;
But poor to it that of the sun would be,"—(Purg. xxiv.)

In regard to this chariot of the *visible Church* we shall only remark

that it figures also in the letter to the cardinals. But who the lady is who is borne in triumph upon this glorious car, we learn unmistakably from the words of the canticle with which she is greeted (Purg. xxx.): *Veni, sponsa, de Libano!* The spouse of the canticle, as we have seen, according to the common interpretation, and that of Dante in particular, as given in the "Convito," is none other than the *ideal Church*, the spouse of Christ. The progress of the chariot and its final disappearance, as described in the "Purgatorio" (Canto xxxii.), briefly summarizes the history of the Church up to that time, when, to the dismay of the beholders, and particularly of Beatrice, it disappears in the forest; whence she foresees and predicts her approaching death, but consoles her attendants with the hope of her speedy resurrection in the words of the Saviour:

*Modicum, et non videbitis me
Et iterum, my sisters predilect,
Modicum et vos videbitis me.*

We see from the context that all this was enacted as a representation of what had been, in order that the poet, on his return from his fancied pilgrimage, might record it for posterity; that Beatrice, therefore, whose mystic death the poet describes here for the third time, is none other than Christ's spouse, the ideal Church.

But *how are we to understand the death of the Church?* In the letters to the Cardinals, it is described as a *quasi* death (*quasi in funere*), but with all the dire effects of real death, leaving the holy city desolate (*Quomodo sedet civitas!*). In the "Vita Nuova" it is described a *real* death, attended by the same desolation; which is fully justified, even required, by the poetic character of the allegory. In the "Purgatorio" it is again represented, as it were, dramatically, in a new allegorical form. It is, therefore, the same allegorical death of the spouse of Christ, but represented in various ways. The literal interpretation is, therefore, to be sought in the epistle to the Cardinals, in which the poet divests his diction of its allegorical attire. Now, in the letter to the Cardinals, it is evident that the death of the Church bewailed by the poet is the so-called *Babylonian captivity* of the Popes in Avignon. By the Pope's exile, in the mind of the poet, the Church was dead, her soul was, as it were, severed from the body; her visible body was removed into exile, and thus the soul was bereft of its external connatural activity. Hence the desolation of the holy city; hence the poet's grief and mourning at the Church's bier; hence the bold language to "the princes of the earth"; hence his bold bursts of plaintive passion.

But, how can the exile of the Popes be regarded as the death of the Church? Did the poet not know the words of the Church's

Founder : "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it?" First, we must bear in mind that in the letter to the Cardinals, which was written in prose, albeit not sober prose, he calls it a *quasi-death*. For the rest, we must make a twofold allowance in behalf of the poet; one for the boldness of his poetic conception and language, and the poetic form of the allegory in which he clothed his thoughts; another for his fiery temperament and his political views. He was a poet, a hot-headed Italian, an ardent Ghibelline. This sufficiently accounts for whatever exaggeration may be found in this part of his allegory.

Taking this view of Dante's beloved, we have a clue to the understanding, not only of his poetry, but also of his life and character. Thus we may understand how he could come under the influence of Beatrice at the early age of nine years. It may have been at the time of his first Communion, when children are brought more closely into contact with the living Church, which, from this time particularly, begins to shape their lives by its guidance, its teachings, and its sacraments. But need we wonder that in such troublous times, when the visible body of the Church was in exile and the soul seemed to have departed from it; when political passions ran so high—the poet should for a time grow cold in his first love to the Church, and that he should seek his bliss in the pursuit of secular learning to the neglect or exclusion of the teachings of her whom he had chosen as the mistress of his life? And this seems to be the sum and substance of his offence against the guide and teacher of his youth and childhood. Yet he makes this disloyalty the object of bitter self-reproach.

The things that present were,
With their false pleasure turned aside my steps
Soon as your countenance concealed itself.

And Beatrice, on her part, rebukes him on her reappearing to him, not only by her cold demeanor, which made the blood freeze in his heart, but also with cutting words (*Purg.* xxxi.): "that he might feel the greater shame for his transgression, and another time hearing the sirens, he might be strong."

In an opposite way
My buried flesh should have directed thee.
Never to thee presented art or nature
Pleasure so great as the fair limbs wherein
I was enclosed, which scattered are on earth.

At this rebuke he felt as a chidden child in his guiltiness.

Even as children silent in their shame
Stand listening, with their eyes upon the ground,
And conscious of their fault, and penitent;
So was I standing.

It was during those dreary wanderings in the *selva oscura* of worldly wisdom, without the higher direction of Beatrice, the God-given teacher of mankind, that Dante encountered Virgil, sent by his beloved to lead him back on the way of penance and atonement to the purity of his first love. The Roman poet conducts him along the *purgative way* through hell and purgatory, as far as the natural light of reason could reach, when he consigns him to the guidance of his beloved, who by her supernatural light leads him on the *illuminative way* through the spheres of the blessed, until he comes to the throne of Him who dwells in light inaccessible. Here her mission ends; for the Church on earth is concerned only with wayfarers still on their pilgrimage. Therefore, having conducted him to the goal of his journey, she retires and entrusts him to St. Bernard, the symbol of divine contemplation, who presents him to the glorious Queen of Heaven, through whose intervention he is raised to the light of glory, to the intuitive vision of the Triune God—to consummate *union with God*.

From that time forward what he saw was greater
Than our discourse, that to such vision yields,
And memory yieldeth unto such excess.—(Parad. xxxiii.)

Thus far, we have endeavored to show the allegorical character of Dante's Beatrice, as presented in the "Vita Nuova," as well as in the "Divina Comedia;" and we have tried to establish, from the poet's own works, what we consider to be the true meaning of the allegory. On intrinsic evidence, we have come to the conclusion that Beatrice symbolizes Christ's spouse, the Church—the God-given teacher and guide of individuals, and of the whole human race, the dispenser of Divine grace, the divine institution that leads men to true bliss; whence she received the name of Beatrice (bliss-bestowing) by those "who knew not how to call her." It will add new force to the arguments advanced, if we now proceed to consider the allegorical nature of Dante's poetry *in general*, and then, as far as space may permit, apply the result of our investigation, *in particular*, to some of the chief personages who figure in the poet's works, particularly in the "Divina Comedia."

First, we maintain that the general character of Dante's poetry is *allegorical*, or symbolic. In this view of the poet's works we are supported by the authority of the greatest critics and commentators, ancient and modern, as well as by the poet's own utterances. We cited a number of the most approved of the ancient commentators in defence of the exclusively allegorical character of Beatrice. Here, we shall only add, that the same commentators are no less explicit in the allegorical interpretation of the poet's works in

general, and of the chief personages who act in the marvellous drama of the "Divina Comedia."

Of modern critics, we shall only quote the opinion of Frederic von Schlegel, who stands in the highest reputation as a critic of ancient and modern literature. He gives a fair expression to the views which we would establish in this paper. The literature of the middle ages, he says, "may be classed under three heads—the chivalrous, the amatory, and the *allegorical*. To the latter belong those poetic compositions, of which the entire aim and scope, as well as the internal arrangement and external form, are entirely allegorical, *as is the case in the works of Dante*. While the allegorical spirit pervades the whole of mediæval poetry (including chivalrous and erotic poetry), conveying mystic meanings in the representations of life, *Dante only interweaves his representations of life here and there in the framework and structure of his all-embracing allegory*." Our proposition could hardly be put more forcibly than by saying that Dante's creations are allegorical in scope and aim, in arrangement and form; that his poetry is a "world-encompassing allegory."

Yet, great as is the authority of the German critic, we must attach still greater weight to the poet's own utterances. All his *ex professo* expositions of his poems go to prove their decidedly allegorical character. It is particularly in the "Convito" that we must look for the true interpretation of the poet's meaning. Though, in his other works he, from time to time, throws out some explanatory hints, it is only here that he gives anything like a real commentary.

At the beginning of the second book of the "Convito," before entering on the exposition of the first canzone, he reminds the reader that literary composition admits of four different interpretations—the literal, the allegorical, the moral, and the anagogical. The latter two, however, are closely connected with the allegorical, so that we need take no further notice of them in this paper. "The literal meaning extends only to the proper signification of words. It is merely what the words express according to that sense which is peculiar to them."

The allegorical meaning, according to Dante, is "that which is concealed under the veil of fiction (*favole*), a truth hidden beneath a graceful falsehood (*bella mensogna*), as when Ovid says that Orpheus, by the sound of the lyre, tamed wild beasts and drew after him trees and rocks; which is as much as to say—the wise man by his words tames and soothes savage breasts, and guides at will those who are estranged from science and culture. For those who do not lead the life of civilized men are, in a certain sense, to be compared with hard rocks." Here the poet takes occasion to

remind us that theologians, in the exposition of the Scriptures, take a different view of the allegorical sense, doubtless, inasmuch as in the Scriptures the allegorical supposes also a true literal meaning, while in poetry the literal meaning is only fictitious. And this difference he subsequently explains by the example of the crossing of the Red Sea by the Israelites, which, besides being allegorical, has also a true literal and historical signification.

The poet accordingly explains the first and second canzone of the "Convito" as merely allegorical, while in the exposition of the third, in which he has not adopted the allegorical form, he takes care to remind the reader that he had made an exception in that case, and abandoned his peculiar style, that is, the erotic-allegorical (*lo mio stile, cioè modo soave, che di amor parlando ho tenuto*); and therefore, he wishes in this canzone to be understood literally. Hence it follows that the general character of the poems of the "Convito" is allegorical; and these do not differ in their general tenor from the other productions of the poet, which are likewise allegorical. Hence, we must conclude that the poems in the "Vita Nuova," and, in fact, the entire work, which is absolutely of the same form and character as the two mentioned canzoni of the "Convito," is decidedly allegorical; and that the literal sense is not historical, as is the case in the Scriptures, in which the literal text is also historically true. If taken in their literal sense, therefore, the "Vita Nuova," as well as those two canzoni of the "Convito," according to the poet's own acknowledgment, contain nothing but "favole" and "belle menzogne," viz., fiction and pleasing falsehoods. Their true sense is, consequently, to be sought under the veil of allegory.

The same conclusion may be arrived at from the poet's letter to Cangrande, on the nature of the "Divina Comedia." Here, in discussing the literal meaning of his master-work, he restricted it merely to what the terms, the *form of the poem*, i.e., according to his own explanation, its division into three parts (hell, purgatory, and paradise), into one hundred cantos, and into lines and stanzas; besides its poetic, fictitious, and descriptive character—all of which, as is manifest, give no insight into the true meaning of the work. The true meaning, therefore, is entirely concealed under the form of the allegory, which the poet, however, declines to unravel, leaving the interpretation altogether to the studious reader. And this we find to be the course generally pursued by the poet also in the "Vita Nuova," where he gives only the lyrical standpoint and the disposition of the poems, without, however, betraying the meaning of the allegory, leaving the true understanding to the intelligent reader (*a chi lo intende*). Nor does he care to be understood by all, but only by those who have intelligence of love (*chi hanno intelletto d'amore*), that is, by the true friends of wis-

dom. The only exception he makes is in the case of the canzoni explained in the "Convito," which he considered especially liable to misunderstanding. That the general tenor of these poems is allegorical we have already seen.

Let us, furthermore, consider how Dante handles the allegory. This is best illustrated from the "Convito," where we have the poet's own interpretation. Here he sings his love to a gentle lady in the most glowing erotic strains. His beloved is depicted with great individuality. Yet this noble lady, to whom he pays court, who smiles upon him with such sympathy is, according to his own declaration, none other than *philosophy*. "I declare and assure," he says, "that this lady, to whom I turned my attention, after my first love, is the fairest and noblest daughter of the Lord of the universe, to whom Pythagoras gave the name of philosophy. (II., 6.) The excessive ardor of love expressed in the canzoni of the "Convito," he assures us, induced him to make this declaration, lest his poetic outpourings might be mistaken for the passion of sensual love, which would cast dishonor on his name (I., 2.). Such a misinterpretation, it seems, was not to be feared in the case of the poems prompted by his first love (to Beatrice), though not less passionate in their expression. They were rightly understood, at least by those who had "intelligence of love." How the vulgar herd might understand them, the poet, as he repeatedly assures us, recked not.

Not only the person of this donna, however, is symbolic, but also her various attributes and actions. "The reader must know," he says, "that this gentlewoman is philosophy; who, in fact, is a lady full of sweetness, adorned with modesty, marvellous in knowledge. . . . And where I say of her, that he who will see salvation must contemplate her eyes; her *eyes* are to be understood as her *demonstrations*, which by their influence on the eye of the mind enkindle the soul to love." "And where it is said: he (*i.e.*, the devotee of philosophy) must not fear the dint of *sighs*, the meaning is: he must not dread the hardship of *study* and the conflict of *doubts*" (II., 16.). Again by his ardent *love* to this donna he wishes us to understand the *study* which was prompted by his love of philosophy, and which gained for him ever new and lofty conceptions of her worth (III., 10.). The *gentlewomen* for whom he sang the praises of this compassionate lady are those souls who devote themselves to the study of philosophy, *i.e.*, the *philosophers* themselves; her outward form is *wisdom*; her *soul* is her love to her followers; her *manners* are the *moral precepts* which she teaches; her *smiles* and *frowns* finally are the *facility* or *difficulty* of understanding her teachings (III., 14, 15).

This allegorical character is not peculiar to Dante alone. It is the predominant feature of mediæval poetry in general, and not

only of poetry; it is the prevailing tone of all thought and discourse. We need only recall the mystic bride of St. Francis of Assisi, who is depicted by him as a lady arrayed in all beauty and loveliness, adorned with costly jewels and precious stones. And who is this beauteous bride? It is holy poverty, whom the saint had espoused to himself in perpetual wedlock. This was the taste of the times, good or bad as we may choose to call it. Poetry was essentially allegorical; and the form of the allegory in use was borrowed from the erotic minstrelsy of the age. If, therefore, the poet would sing the praises of philosophy, or of any other science, art or institution, human or divine, this was the poetic form which naturally suggested itself. Taking this view of Dante's poetry, which, we think, is the only view in keeping with its peculiar character, and with the spirit of the age, in which he wrote, we find it intelligible and natural; whereas, if we try to interpret it literally, we must pronounce it not only in the worst possible taste, but even extravagant and foolish.

This, as we have shown, is the only reasonable view we can take of Beatrice. She is an exclusively allegorical creation. Let us now make the application to some of the other personages that figure in the poet's works. The evidence we advanced to prove the symbolic character of Beatrice will gain new force by the consideration of the subordinate characters which figure particularly in the "*Divina Comedia*."

Here we must distinguish between *pure* and *mixed* allegory. The former is that which has no reference to historical facts or personages; the latter is based on historical facts, or, at least, clusters around historical personages. An instance of the former is, in our opinion, Beatrice as well as the *donna* philosophy, whom the poet sings as the object of his second love. So are also the various gentlewomen whom the poet groups around them as their handmaids.

As *pure* allegorical figures must be considered, moreover, those represented in *Purg.*, xxix. and xxxi. as accompanying the chariot of the church in the attendance of Beatrice. They are acknowledged by all commentators, as far as we have been able to ascertain, as the symbolical representations of the three theological and four cardinal virtues. And yet they are represented with all the individuality of real characters.

Three maidens at the right wheel in a circle
Came onward dancing; one so very red
That in the fire she hardly had been noted;
The second was as if her flesh and bones
Had all been fashioned out of emerald;
The third appeared as snow but newly fallen
Upon the left hand four made holiday,
Vested in purple, following the measure.—(*Purg.*, xxix.)

Again, after the poet ascended from the cleansing waters of Lethe (symbol of baptism), he is led into the dance of the four fair maidens; and, while each with her arm embraced him, they sang:

We here are nymphs, and in heaven are stars;
 Ere Beatrice descended to the world
 We as her handmaids were appointed her.
 We'll lead thee to her eyes; but for the pleasant
 Light that within them is, shall sharpen thine
 The three beyond, who more profoundly look.—(Purg. xxxi.)

Whereupon the three maidens, representing the three divine virtues, having inspired the poet with faith, hope and love, bring about his reconciliation with his beloved.

Turn, Beatrice, O turn thy holy eyes,
 (Such was their song) unto thy faithful one
 Who has, to see thee, ta'en so many steps.
 In grace do us the grace, that thou unveil
 Thy face to him, so that he may discern
 The second beauty which thou dost conceal.—(*Ibid.*)

If we consider these purely allegorical figures arrayed in all that life-like individuality with which the poet has invested them, can we further marvel at the individual traits with which he has clothed Beatrice, though a mere symbolic figure. If we are constrained to acknowledge that these so concrete and individual creations are but allegorical characters, why should we go out of our way to seek an historical personage to represent the lady whose handmaids are the infused virtues, theological and moral? From this concrete and life-like representation of merely allegorical personages we must conclude, at the very least, that as often as historical evidence is wanting, as in the case of Beatrice, the presumption is in favor of the purely allegorical character.

A further and still more striking evidence of the absolutely allegorical character of the divine poem is to be found in the peculiar manner in which the poet treats his *mixed allegories*, that is, those based on real facts, or persons. A prominent part in the guidance of the poet in his mystic pilgrimage is assigned to *Santa Lucia*. The name, at least, is historical. She is a virgin and martyr honored by the Church. The devotion to her, particularly in Italy, has always been widespread and intense, and it is thought that the poet himself cherished this devotion, and that he invoked the saint's intercession for the recovery of his failing sight. This is all very likely, and may have suggested the name; but, beyond the name, we do not find a single trait of her historical character.

Dante's *Santa Lucia* is justly considered the symbol of the *grace of enlightenment*. As such she ranks even higher in Dante's

allegorical hierarchy than Beatrice. Hence it was she who, dispatched by the Mother of divine grace, advised Beatrice to come to the rescue of the erring poet.

A gentle Lady is in heaven, who grieves
At this impediment, to which I send thee,
So that stern judgment there above is broken.
In her entreaty she besought Lucia
And said: Thy faithful one stands now in need
Of thee, and unto thee I recommend him.—(Inf. ii.)

Whereupon Lucia, "the foe of all that cruel is," repairs to Beatrice and dispatches her to the succor of her beloved. A like service she renders to the poet (*Purg.* ix.) when, disabled and shrouded in darkness, he is raised by her to a higher and purer sphere of light.

Again we find St. Lucy in the glories of Paradise, seated opposite to the Queen of heaven, and to St. Peter, Moses, and Adam, by the side of St. Anne, who, as her name implies, is the personification of divine grace. In all this there is no trace of the historical virgin and martyr of Syracuse; nay, this place which the poet assigns her in the hierarchy of the Saints makes us rather incline to believe either that he never thought of the historic Lucia, or that he altogether disregards her historical character, and makes her serve as a mere symbol.

Another remarkable personage in the "*Divina Comedia*" is the *donna soletta*, who figures in the last cantos of the "*Purgatorio*" under the name of Matilda. The poet encounters her on landing in the earthly paradise—

A lady all alone, who went along
Singing, and cutting floweret after floweret,
With which her pathway was all painted over.—(*Purg.* xxviii.)

This remarkable creation of the poet's genius, who is the mediator between himself and his beloved, is very commonly identified with the Countess Matilda of Tuscany, who is known in history as the powerful and judicious friend and helper of Pope St. Gregory VII., in his efforts towards ecclesiastical reform. This may or may not be the case; but certain it is that not a single trait in her character gives the least evidence of such identity. On the contrary, her character in many points is diametrically opposed to that of the historical Matilda of Tuscany. Considered historically, we would naturally picture her to ourselves as a venerable matron of mature age and grave aspect. Dante's Matilda is a young maiden in the full bloom of youth and beauty. The historical Matilda distinguished herself in the service of the Church by external works of charity; Dante's Matilda appears as

the teacher of all truth, the reconciler of the sinner, the dispenser of supernatural grace. In fact, her activity is altogether of a supernatural character; her peculiar function is the reconciliation of the erring soul with its abandoned spouse, the Church, by instruction, purification, and penance. Hence she not only instructs the poet, but immerses him in Lethe's stream, and makes him drink of the waters of penance and salvation. And all this she does in the service of Beatrice, that is, of the Church.

Hence we conclude that Dante's Matilda, whether she be the famous countess of Tuscany or not, plays a part absolutely allegorical, symbolizing the *priesthood of the Church*, whose function it is to teach; to administer the sacraments, the fountains of grace; to bring back erring souls to the bosom of the Church, that she may further guide them to their final destiny. This same mysterious personage, as Father Gietmann shrewdly concludes, figures also in the attendance of Beatrice in the "*Vita Nuova*." She is that *nameless donna* (the donna of the screen) who was for a time the medium between the poet and his beloved, and whom the public took to be the real object of his love, while the ardor of his affections and the numbers of his lyre were dedicated to a higher theme—the ideal Church herself, not the visible priesthood.

This symbolic part acted by Matilda, therefore, like that of St. Lucy, leads us to the conclusion that under the poet's hand those personages who seem to be historical are altogether divested of their historical character; and that, consequently, their choice is merely incidental or conventional. Hence it is that the probable historical antecedents of Dantesque characters are of little or no importance to the critic or commentator of the divine poet, as they throw little or no light on his real meaning. On the contrary, if the historical side of the characters is unduly emphasized, that only begets confusion and gives occasion to numberless contradictions.

The most historical of all Dante's characters is that of *Virgil*. He was a Lombard, of Mantuan parents, born under Julius.

He lived at Rome under the good Augustus,
During the time of false and lying gods;
A poet was he, and he sang that just
Son of Anchises, who came from Troy.—(Inf. I.)

He was of other poets the honor and light, our poet's master and author, from whom he took

The beautiful style that hath done honor to him.

Thus much the poet tells us of Virgil's history. He was, therefore, a meet guide for a poetic ramble—the representative of all the

human arts and sciences, and, like our poet himself, politically a great admirer of universal monarchy. The choice was, therefore, we take it, deliberate and, at the same time, judicious.

Yet, even in the case of Virgil the historical character is all but lost in the allegory; and Virgil's part in the action is no less allegorical than that of the aforementioned personages. Here he figures altogether as the *personification of philosophy* in its widest sense, that is, human learning and culture as distinguished from supernatural wisdom or revelation, of which Beatrice is the bearer, guardian and teacher. The historical traits of Virgil's character are merely incidentally hinted at by the poet, and are utterly irrelevant to the progress and development of the action. In fact, the Roman poet does nothing but what Plato, Aristotle or Seneca might have done as well, had the poet's fancy pitched upon one of them. His poetic genius and political views, which may have served as motives for his selection, availed him naught in the guidance of his charge.

That the part of Virgil is simply ideal, without any regard to his real historical character, may be inferred also from the place and state which the poet assigns to him in the "Inferno."

A place there is below not sad with torments,
But darkness only, where the lamentations
Have not the sound of wailing, but are sighs.
There dwell I with the little innocents
Snatched by the teeth of death, ere ever they
Were from our sinfulness exempt.
There dwell I among those who the three saintly
Virtues did not put on, and without vice
The others know and followed all of them.

No one knew better than Dante the theological impossibility of such a future state for one who had come to the years of discretion and passed his youth and manhood in this vale of tears. Whence we must infer that Dante, to suit the purpose of his allegory, made Virgil the representative of an unreal state, *i.e.*, the state of mere human reason unaided by any supernatural light or influence (*status naturæ puræ*). This position is well defined by the words of Virgil himself:

The temporal fire and the eternal,
Son, thou hast seen, and to a place art come
Where of myself no further I discern.
By intellect and art I here have brought thee,—(Purg. xxviii.)

And again, with even greater precision:

What reason seeth here,
Myself can tell thee; beyond that await
For Beatrice, since 'tis a work of faith.—(Purg. xviii.)

The Roman poet, therefore, like the characters already reviewed, though an historical personage, acts a part that is purely ideal and symbolic.

A mysterious and altogether shadowy figure in the Purgatorio is the poet *Statius*. He is represented as a Christian poet, who has been led to the light of Christianity by the torch borne before him by the poet Virgil, while the latter himself failed to see its splendor.

Thou first [so he addresses Virgil] directedst me
Towards Parnassus, in its grotto to drink,
And first concerning God didst me enlighten,
Thou didst as he who walketh in the night,
Who bears his light behind which helps him not,
But maketh wise the persons after him . . .

* Through thee a poet I was, through thee a Christian.—(Purg. xxii.)

It may possibly be that Statius was a Christian, but Christianity is certainly no prominent trait in his historical character. And yet, Dante makes him the ideal of a Christian poet and philosopher. He needs his service as such, and he makes him a Christian. Statius acts a part which Virgil, the representative of unaided human reason, cannot play. He is the allegorical figure of *Christian Philosophy*, i.e., philosophy enlightened and guided by supernatural revelation. He is a necessary complement to Virgil in the Purgatorio, and, therefore, he imparts instruction on points that are inaccessible to the pagan philosopher as such. With combined efforts in the service of a higher and nobler mistress (Beatrice), both guide the poet to the confines of the purely supernatural region. In this celestial realm, she, herself, will lead the way, and conduct him to the threshold of the mansion of infinite bliss.

We might go on indefinitely to examine the historical personages of the "Divina Comedia," and we would invariably find them thus divested of their historical character and donned in the mystic robe of allegory, but we feel that we have already trespassed too far on the valuable space of this REVIEW, and, perhaps still more, on the patience of its readers. We hope, however, to have produced sufficient evidence from the poet's own works to establish their decidedly allegorical character, in regard both to their general tenor and to the various characters, in particular, which space permitted us to review. Whence, we may justly conclude, with Frederic von Schlegel, that Dante's poems are essentially allegorical, while his representations of real life are only incidentally inserted in the framework of his all-encompassing allegory. Above all, we hope to have established the purely allegorical character of Beatrice, the most interesting and important personage in the poet's works. We hope to have proved with all that evidence which is possible, and necessary, in a mere literary problem of this

kind, that she is the *symbol of the ideal Church*. Thus conceived, she becomes intelligible to the Christian, and, above all, to the Catholic reader; her providence, her guidance, her influence in regard to the poet, her action in the great drama of his poetic fiction may be sufficiently explained. We believe that this conception of Beatrice will throw new light on the poet's great master-work, the "*Divina Comedia*," the idea and conception of which has, for six hundred years, exercised the minds of literary men.

According to this conception of Beatrice, the gist or idea of the "*Divina Comedia*" is this—the guidance of the poet by his beloved, that is, by the Church, from the vanities and corruptions of this world to the intimate union with God, to the highest contemplation of divine things, which terminates in the blissful possession of God Himself, by the two-fold light of reason and revelation, on the three successive ways of spiritual life—the purgative, the illuminative, and unitive. And the poet's pilgrimage is that of every individual who seeks salvation, and of mankind at large. Hence, Dante's "*Divina Comedia*," which purports to be the poetic presentment of the thought and experience of his own life, may be justly regarded as *the grand epic of the human race* in its struggle for salvation under the guidance of Christ's spouse, the ideal Church.

JAMES CONWAY, S.J.

"FATHER HERMANN."

THE grand old Carmelite order, which, gathering to itself saints, teachers, reformers, preachers, during century after century as its records swell, counts its legendary foundations even from pre-Christian times, when Elias *walked with God* in solitary sanctity, was one still autumn day, some thirty years ago, holding a festival at Lyons, great, restless, mundane, mercantile city of Jacobin and infidel, on the occasion of a new foundation.

It was a foundation which must have rejoiced the hearts of its benefactors, as they cast appreciative glances round the newly-painted walls and decorated chapel ; for it was an ancient monastery of their own, once appropriated by government for barracks, and its chapel desecrated as a soldiers' dormitory, now bought back by the order to which it had first belonged, at a cost of 154,000 francs, and cleansed and renewed by the pious care of one of the most illustrious Carmelite Fathers of this century, Père Augustin du Saint Sacrement, or, as his own world will ever call him, Father Hermann.

Many of the most eminent members of the order as well as kindred religious and secular priests were present at this opening ceremony ; and, indeed, at the recent Feast of St. Theresa an interesting example of Catholic brotherhood had been manifested in a High Mass sung by the Superior of the Jesuits, assisted by a Dominican as deacon, a Franciscan as sub-deacon, and a Carmelite Father as server, all joining in fraternal union to commemorate the great Doctress of the Church, that humble nun, Teresa of Jesus.

On this twenty-fourth of November of which we write, the feast of St. John of the Cross, Teresa's director and coadjutor, there had been a solemn benediction of the bells—that quaint and seldom seen ceremony of middle-age times ; the four noble God-parents of the silver-toned messengers had presented their "christening gifts," a thousand-franc note each, and now the Cardinal Archbishop of the diocese, having offered the Holy Sacrifice, had joined the rest of the company at a modest dejeuner in the newly constructed refectory. As the Father Vicar chatted to the Cardinal about the new foundation and their guests, his eye chanced to rest upon a cluster of tonsured heads, two of whom wore the habit of St. Teresa, while the third, almost at their side, was garbed in ordinary *soutane*. One can almost fancy some

fleeting likeness caught by his keen eye, between their dark earnest glances, thoughtful yet serene countenances, and expressive Semitic features, as, motioning from one to the other, "Does your Eminence remark," he smiled, "that we have in our company *three* of the children of Abraham?"

"You are mistaken, Reverend Father," broke in a voice thrilling with emotion, as the black robed priest rose to his feet and with a magnificent gesture drew all eyes to the Crucifix which hung above their heads. "You are mistaken; *we are four!*"

The speaker was no other than the famous Père Alphonse de Ratisbonne.

His fellow-converts—they in the white robe of Carmel—were, one of them, at least, equally well known with himself in the religious world of that day. Some years ago, the present writer was invited, at the well known Carmelite Church, in Kensington, to join a confraternity whose object is the fulfilment of that too often neglected duty of Thanksgiving which seems to lie so lightly upon the consciences even of those whose petitions, worship, reparation and all other devotions, are of daily iteration. "Were there not ten cleansed?" asks the Divine Voice of the multitude of converts who throng our churches. And so this Confraternity appeals to them and to all. "It was founded," said the good Carmelite Father who brought it under our notice, "by the famous Father Hermann." Years afterward, amid far Pyrenean snows, our wandering feet led us to a once crowded health resort, now empty and forsaken by the fickle crowd in favor of newer fashions in bath and cures; and here, towering sadly and silently in the keen mountain air, stands a stately pile, with locked gates and government seal upon its door, a wreath of immortelles, as for a grave, upon its entrance; the Church of the Carmelites, from whence they have been driven away. And here again came the same words; "It was built by notre Père Hermann—this grand and venerable sanctuary—here his voice echoed, here his feet trod, here, we may say, was his retreat of predilection; the once far-famed Carmelite Monastery at Bagnères de Bigorre. Many another good work from East to West, in England and in France, claims to this day the honor of his initiative; and it seems scarcely fitting that so recently lost a jewel in the Church's earthly vestment should pass out of memory or fail to receive some grateful thoughts from those he has left behind and who, like the Associates of the Scapular and of the Nocturnal Adoration, or the 50,000 Associates of Thanksgiving, have already reaped rich blessings from his labors.

There is a large Jewish colony at Hamburg; they number, in fact, some 25,000 souls; and among them the family of Cohen may be counted as by no means one of the least in rank, being indeed a

priestly race, descendants of Aaron, of the tribe of Levi, in memory of which a Cohen, when he appears in the synagogue, holds the right of imparting the sacerdotal benediction. The subject of this memoir would in after life sometimes relate how among his childish recollections was the oft-repeated vision of his father and uncles standing, grave and solemn, on the dais or steps of the holy place, with hands outstretched, blessing the congregation.

David Cohen, the father of Hermann, was a well-to-do tradesman and prosperous member of the busy and influential Jewish colony in Hamburg. We gather that the world—with its honors, successes, interests,—reigned supreme over the Cohen household, and that they adhered rather to the modern toned down, German-speaking section of their co-religionists, who follow a reform designed to facilitate their mundane interests, than to the stern old Hebrews of other times. Hermann, with his elder brother, attended the principal college of the town, and was a precociously intelligent child, making such progress with his studies that at only nine years old he was advanced enough to be able to enter the “third class,” which, it seems, caused the masters some perplexity, as the other pupils in that class averaged fourteen years and over. However the difficulty was solved by his failing health, which forced his parents to remove him from college under medical advice, and continue his studies at home. Long before this he had shown a special aptitude for music, and at six years old he not only played with wonderful execution, but composed, like young Mozart, wondrous improvisations, which held his auditors spell-bound. So, when his health broke down over Greek and Latin, they took him home, gave him a music-master, and left him more or less to himself. And then began a curious phase in his life. The “professor” to whose care little Hermann was confided, seems to have been a half crazy, half licentious musician, whose “genius” was supposed at once to excuse and explain his lawless life. Under the guise of musical study he led his youthful pupil into the wild tangles of his own “Bohemian” existence: they hunted, they gamed, they spent their nights at the theatre, their days at the café or the race-course. The boy was introduced everywhere as “le petit prodige,” and his childish fingers won applause as they dashed off marvels of execution in concert after concert at the piano. They visited various German towns, and everywhere success attended them, till at last, emboldened by the encouragement he had received, and finding that his master could teach him nothing more, young Hermann, like every other child of genius before and since, turned his thoughts towards Paris—Paris the centre of the world! His parents yielded to his wishes, and, accompanied by his mother and a younger brother and sister, Hermann left the parental roof to seek fame and fortune in that capital of modern civilization.

Almost on his arrival in Paris, this child of twelve years old found himself by a strange chance and without any effort on his own part, full in the centre of all that was most brilliant, most stirring, most *intense* (to borrow a word from the art-jargon of our day) in the literary society of that time. It had been arranged that he should study composition at the Conservatoire, and claim from one of the three great masters of piano-forte then in Paris, Chopin, Zimmerman, and Liszt, the *mécanique* of the art. So the youthful prodigy was presented to each in turn, took one lesson from Chopin, another from Zimmerman, and lastly presented himself before the fiery Pole. Liszt at first refused to take another pupil; then, half unwillingly, consented to hear the boy play; and, when he had heard him, relented and accepted the task. From that moment Hermann became the *enfant gâté*, the petted favorite of the artist. He was with him from morning till night, accompanied him to the salons of the great, played at his bidding, and was the petted darling of the beau-monde. He is described as a pretty boy of twelve years, with long girlish curls falling on his shoulders, bright eyes, and a very childish appearance—in fact, the petticoated costume of that time, when "knickerbockers" and "sailor suits" were things of the future. Bye and bye, in Liszt's own particular circle, no dinner party was considered complete without the baby musician, who would come home gaily in the small hours of the morning after a succession of visits to one salon after another whose titled occupants vied with each other to entertain for a few moments the young hero of the hour. The mother meanwhile watched and trembled at home, keeping anxious vigil for her child's return. And, when he came, the entire house was at his beck and call. No noise in the morning, for Hermann was sleeping; silence at midday, for Hermann was studying; still later Hermann, the pivot of the household, might perchance be composing; and younger brother or sister must steal in on tip-toe lest the divine afflatus be disturbed! We have known, some of us, what it is to live with genius—the genius which sleeps by day and courts inspiration by night; and the grand mother-love which so worshipingly surrounded the boy-musician with every device of tender care and anxious forethought, was in after years very tenderly and gratefully recorded, in his narrative of their home life during this Paris time.

It is hardly necessary to remind our readers that the circle of which young Hermann thus found himself a member was composed of the very cream of the artistic and literary life of that day. Need we do more than say that Madame Georges Sand, then in the height of her glory, was the only woman there, and that the authoress about whom all Paris was wondering, romanc-

ing, questioning, whispering, took Liszt's "enfant prodige" into her intimacy, kept him by her side while she wrote for days together, set him to play the piano or roll cigarettes by turns, to soothe her nerves or stimulate her imagination, and wrote and talked of him everywhere by a pet name which through her lips has resounded through Europe. "Are you not *le petit puzzi* of Georges Sand?" he was afterwards questioned by great ladies on far-away shores. "C'était comme un passeport qui me donnait entrée dans tons les salons de l'Europe." The word was an invention of Liszt's from *puzzig*, German for *darling*; and "ce charmant personnage de puzzi," "le mélancolique puzzi" was ever on their lips and pens. He tells himself, naïvely enough, how when first presented to the authoress he had never read her works, but knew she was spoken of with praise; and soon, when not actually at her side, he became so absorbed in those wondrous romances that he almost neglected his own beloved piano, and could only bring himself to the necessary hours of practice by propping up his *Lelia* or *Consuelo* upon the music rest of his piano and devouring it with his eyes while mechanically running scales. Another intimate friend—though we can scarce call it friendship between the man of mature years and the boy of twelve—but patron or admirer, was La Mennais, who for some time was young Hermann's chosen master and hero, his oracle, from whose lips he drank in every wild breath of revolt, insubordination and erroneous philosophy preached so vehemently by the author of that magnificently resonant yet untrue phrase with which he threw down the glove in his challenge to society and religion, "l'homme est né libre, et pourtant il est dans les fers." Perhaps the tiny volume still exists on whose opening page is traced the words: "Souvenir offert a mon cher petit puzzi par F. de la Mennais." Like others, Hermann dreamed that the golden age was approaching, heralded by "Les Paroles d'un Croyant," and recorded in "Le Monde," a journal under the joint editorship of George Sand and La Mennais. Passing over to Geneva with Liszt, who had been asked to form a new Conservatoire there, he made pilgrimages to Fernay and rhapsodied before Rousseau's statue, while his eccentric master, who had led his feet to the pasture of Voltairianism, chanced to awaken for one moment in his pupil some fleeting thought of becoming a Christian by the gift of a Bible, in which was written, "Blessed are the clean of heart, for they shall see God"; but he was uncertain whether to embrace Catholicity or Protestantism, and so the brief fancy passed away.

To be clean of heart! What a yearning there lies deep down in the heart of the most God-forgetting souls after their own long lost purity! As sings a poet among that that self-same company:

"Etre pur, etre sublime, etre fier, et croire,
A toute pureté."

Hermann drank deep of the fount of worldly pleasure among the artists' circle in which he lived. He continued to play in public and to pursue the study of music, rather because of the money it brought him, and which he spent in gaming and luxurious living, than for its own sake, and so the years passed on, while he went hither and thither, to Italy, to London, to his own native Hamburg, giving concerts, and successful onse, too, wherever he went. He became acquainted with Mario, then in the zenith of his fame, and together they passed seasons in Paris, winters in London, where Mario sang and Hermann played and gave lessons, and both reaped a rich harvest from their joint labors. And meanwhile, all unknown to themselves and to the world, the hour of grace drew nigh.

One Friday in the month of May, 1847, a certain Prince de la Moskowa made of Hermann Cohen a seemingly trivial request. It was that the young pianist would replace him during the Fridays in May at a neighboring church where he was unable to fulfil an engagement to sing with an amateur choir at benediction. Hermann readily assented and went to the place indicated the same day. At the moment of benediction a sudden, swift, indefinable emotion seemed, as it were, to sweep open the soul of the young Jew. We cannot express—he himself declared that he could not put it into words—suffice it to say that a week passed by, and on the following Friday he was again at his post. This time, as the Sacred Host was uplifted for adoration the same sensation returned. "I felt, as it were, a great weight descend upon me which *forced me to my knees*, yea, even to bow to the ground in adoration." The month of May went by, yet again and again Hermann returned to kneel in the same place. On Sundays at Mass his whole soul seemed moved; he hunted out a dust-laden prayer book on the shelves of one of his friends, studied it, prayed from it, and finally, going to the Duchesse de Kangan, begged her to direct him to a priest. Still the conversion was not altogether accomplished. As he said himself: "*Y'avis peur des pretres*," and the fatherly counsels of the good Abbé Legrand, to whom the Duchesse had introduced him, won his admiration rather than his contrition. While thus wavering he went to Ems to give a concert, and on the Sunday after his arrival he went to Mass, as had become of late his custom. As the Mass proceeded he felt the same supernatural emotion again flood his soul, and at the moment of the Elevation a burst of tears gushed from his eyes, and he knew that grace had found him. "I had often wept in my childhood, but never such tears as those. All at once I saw before me all the sins of my

past life, hideous, vile, revolting, worthy the wrath of the Sovereign Judge. And yet I felt also a wondrous calm, God in his mercy forgiving me these sins and accepting my firm resolution to love Him above all things henceforth. I left that church a Christian, as much Christian as it is possible to be without yet having received holy baptism." On leaving the Church after Mass he was met and questioned by a pious lady of his acquaintance, an ambassador's wife, on the cause of his evident emotion. He told her, and she remarked that this grace must have come to him through Mary, to whom he should therefore bear special devotion; and as she bid him farewell she placed in his hands a little picture of the Assumption. The following day, eager to revisit the good Abbé who had begun his instruction, he returned to Paris, and there, so transfigured by grace as to be literally hardly recognizable, he read, prayed, studied as a catechumen.

The Abbé de Ratisbonne, himself a convert from Judaism, has built a memorial chapel of that miracle of divine grace in the Rue du Regard, Paris, and to it is attached a convent whose inmates, nuns and orphans, have each and all been gathered out of the darkness of Judaism into the light of faith. Here they pray, work, and suffer for the conversion of their brethren; here, from time to time, the healing waters of baptism descend upon some trembling neophyte; and here, on the twenty-eighth of August, a Saturday, the day specially consecrated to the Blessed Virgin, at three o'clock in the afternoon, before a numerous and fervent crowd of fellow-worshippers, Hermann Cohen was received into the Fold of Christ.

"Wilt thou be baptized?"

"I will."

And the chorus of white-robed maidens broke into a litany composed by Père Ratisbonne:

"Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews,

"Have mercy upon the children of Israel,

"Jesus, Divine Messiah expected by the Jews,

"Have mercy, etc.

"Jesus, the Desired of Nations,

"Jesus, of the Tribe of Juda,

"Jesus, Who didst heal the deaf, the dumb, the blind,

"Have mercy, etc.

"Lamb of God Who takest away the sins of the world,

"Forgive them, for they know not what they do."

And as they sang the waters of baptism fell upon the kneeling catechumen, and in the rapture of that moment he seemed for one brief moment to catch in very actuality a glimpse of the Paradise of God.

And now a new page began in the life of the heretofore Jew musician, Hermann Cohen, now "Mary Augustine Henry," soon to be also "of the Blessed Sacrament." His longed-for first communion took place ten days after his baptism, on the 8th of September, 1847, and, three months later, his confirmation, at the hands of the martyr Archbishop of Paris, Mgr. Affre, who not long afterwards was called on, like his Divine Master, to give his life for his sheep. It has often been noticed that almost every convert to the Catholic faith, whether from Protestantism or other heresy, has, at the time of his reception into the Church, been drawn by some special point, some particular aspect of the Church, or dogma, or devotion, which to that soul has proved the magnet of his heart's attraction.

With some it is the intellectual side, validity of orders, the supremacy of the See of Peter, the necessity for an infallible teacher; or, as with Newman, the testimony of history; or, as with Faber, the visible unity of the Church. With others it is the more emotional side, the need of absolution, the communion of saints, the cultus of Mary, or, as in the case of Hermann, the presence of Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament. One has known souls to whom the practices of the Church seemed almost a blank, confession unneeded, even shrunk from; the doctrines of the Church "hard sayings," and submission a fierce struggle; who yet could not choose but enter, so strange and strong became the drawing, so passionate the yearning, to kneel at the Altar and receive the Bread of Heaven. Hermann was one of these. He says himself, in his journal, that "while yet a Jew he longed with great desire to fly to the holy table," and yearned after baptism only that he might be united to Jesus in Holy Communion. "I wept with envy," he writes, "on seeing others communicate."

On becoming a Christian, the thoughts of this "convert of the Holy Eucharist," as he styled himself, flew naturally towards the sacerdotal or religious life; but he had 30,000 francs of debts to pay, and was forced to remain in the world until, having earned that amount by concerts and lessons, he should be free. So he started anew on the path of "scales, scales, nothing but scales," through which every would-be pianist, from Chopin to the beginner of to-day, must needs pass, reading, as he fingered the notes, no longer George Sand and her contemporaries, but "*La Perfection Chretienne*" of Rodriquez. During the time of his former successes as pianist, he had occasionally attempted composition, but met with little success. Now, with the quickened instincts of his new life he turned his pen towards the composition of religious melodies, and produced a number of hymns and other works which, notably a collection of "22 Cantiques" in honor of the

Blessed Virgin, met with enthusiastic approval and popularity. Long after he had been invested with the robe of a Carmelite Father, a Mass of his own composition was sung at Bordeaux at the close of a mission, and, with its grave, sweet, solemn harmonies, "seemed," as one of its auditors recorded, "an echo from celestial choirs."

During the interval of waiting between baptism and his novitiate, and while working hard to pay his debts, he, in concert with M. de la Bomblerie, founded the now well-known "*CŒuvre de l'Adoration Nocturne*," for the object, as the notes of its first meeting record, of "the Exposition and Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament, the reparation of the injuries and insults offered to it, and to draw down upon France the benediction of God and avert the punishments which menace her."

As soon as, having paid his debts, he found himself free to embrace the religious life, he consulted various theologians as to whether he should become a religious or a secular priest, and, amongst others, the celebrated Dominican, Père Lacordaire.

"Have you the courage to let yourself be spit upon in the face and not say a word?" asked Lacordaire.

"Yes," replied his questioner, unhesitatingly.

"Then go and be a monk!"

He presented himself accordingly at a Carmelite monastery near Bordeaux, and was admitted as a postulant; but it was necessary to obtain a special dispensation for the admission of a converted Jew into the order, and this permission was refused by the Superior-General, who feared that the neophyte was too recent a convert for admission. Nothing daunted, Hermann journeyed to Rome with the intention of appealing to the Pope, but, finding the Council-General of the Carmelite order just assembled there, he laid his case before them, and had the joy of receiving an affirmative reply. Back to Bordeaux he flew, waiting for nothing, not even to see the Pope, who was at Naples, in his eagerness to enter the novitiate, and on the sixth of October he put on the religious habit.

One hardly dares to penetrate the sacred retirement of a religious novice; yet we cannot choose but linger over some of the echoes which reach us in letters or visits from relations. The sole favors which Hermann had asked on entering was that his cell might be the one nearest to the chapel, that so in the lonely night watches he might feel as close as possible to the Tabernacle. His first tasks as a novice were the daily cleansing of the offices, sweeping the passages, and dusting the community room. These he found delightful, and the humble fare of meagre soups and cabbage in scanty measure so delicious, that he declared himself forced to distract his attention from the food while eating, lest he should

give way to over-indulgence. His novitiate lasted for a year, during which time his mother visited him and remained for ten days essaying by every means she could devise to turn him from his purpose of becoming a religious ; while he on his side wept and prayed for her conversion. On the 7th of October, 1850, he was professed, and on the 20th of April following, Easter Eve, ordained a priest, saying his first Mass on Easter Sunday and preaching his first sermon—on "Frequent Communion"—within the same week. From this sermon onwards, during all his active and eloquent apostolate, it was afterwards remarked that he never preached a single sermon without some reference to the Blessed Sacrament ; he had, in fact, bound himself by vow never to do so.

We might naturally suppose that so ardent a convert as the novice, now Père, Hermann, and one too with whom family affection had ever been a prominent feature in his life, should turn his thoughts and prayers with special earnestness towards the object of obtaining the same grace for his beloved ones : and very soon we find him begging prayers and pilgrimages for that end from all about him. The good nun who had composed the words of his "Cantiques" and from whom he received much sympathy, suggested that his sister, Madame R., should be engaged as teacher of music at the convent school to which the nun belonged, in order to facilitate their holy designs upon her soul. Their arrangements were duly made, and Mère Pauline's influence soon made itself felt over the sensitive Jewish lady ; while "Père Augustin" kept her au courant of the more spiritual agencies set on foot by his loving solicitude. "If you only knew all that is being done in the diocese for the conversion of my family," he writes to her ; "besides a large number of general communions in various seminaries and convents, nearly 600 persons went on pilgrimage to Notre Dame de Peyragude, besides the whole of our community and the neighboring clergy. From four o'clock in the morning until midday the Communions never ceased. I myself gave 150 at my own Mass."

How efficacious these prayers were found to be may be learned from the fact that eighteen years afterwards Père Augustin returned to the same shrine to give thanks for the conversion of no less than ten members of his family. Very soon after the first pilgrimage his dearly loved sister came to visit him with her husband and child, and long and earnest were his pleadings with her. After hearing her brother preach on the Mystery of the Holy Trinity she came to him and said, "I know now that I shall be damned if I do not embrace the Catholic faith ; but I prefer to be damned [damnée] rather than be separated from my George (her only child), and I am certain that he would be taken from me should I

become a Catholic!" Not knowing what to answer her, as he afterwards wrote, her brother turned round and exclaimed, "Oh, how will you dare to go back to Mère Marie Pauline and let her know that you believe and yet have not the courage to confess it?" She hesitated, began to argue again, and finally faltered "If I can be baptized without my husband's knowledge, I want to be a Christian before returning to Paris." It was done as she desired; Madam R—— received the Sacraments of Baptism and of the Holy Eucharist from her brother's hands, on the Feast of the Sacred Heart, June 19th, and a few days afterwards the R—— family returned to Paris, little guessing that one of their number had become *a follower of the Nazarene*. From the moment of her reception into the Church, her only son, little George, a child of seven years old, began to show a most ardent desire to become a Christian, and, as we shall see later, he became a veritable little confessor of the faith, while his mother, of whose conversion he like the rest of the family was unaware, became so strengthened with the "Bread of the strong," which in Paris she was able to receive almost daily, that she was enabled to suffer for Christ's sake the long dreaded separation to avert which, in those first days of darkness, she had been even willing to imperil her soul.

Three years after this event, while preaching the Advent sermons at Lyons, Père Hermann received the news of his mother's death. She passed away in silence—a Jewess outwardly as she had lived; no sign of hope had come to console the devoted son who for more than eight years had unceasingly besieged Heaven with his prayers on her behalf. His family, sisters, brother, father, all were dear, but the mother above all, she to whom he owed his life, who had watched and nursed and cared for him with almost more than mother's love all through that time of worldliness and vanity when he had had no care for himself or her; of all souls that soul was the one for which he was ready to give all that he might gain it to eternal life; and she had died, and made no sign. His superiors sent him to Paris to console his family; and he found words, in the midst of his own grief, to win others to repentance, in a penetrating discourse on "The Sorrow of Loss Through Death." Speaking some time later to the venerable Curé d' Ars, of his trouble in knowing that his mother had died unbaptised, the holy man let fall an unlooked for word of encouragement. "Hope on," said he, "you will one day receive, on the feast of the Immaculate Conception, a letter which will give you great consolation." Six years after his mother's death, and when these words were all but forgotten, a Jesuit Father handed to Père Hermann a letter addressed to himself, the writer of which was absolutely unknown to him. Its contents were to the effect

that the writer, believing herself to be on her deathbed, wished to inform him of a communication she had received, during the first solemn moments after receiving the Holy Communion one day, from our Lord Himself. He reminded her of a conversation which she had held on the previous evening with a pious friend who expressed her surprise that our Lord should have remained deaf to the prayers of Père Hermann for his mother, "He who has promised to accord all that is asked in prayer." He desired her to tell that friend "that all prayer which has My glory and the salvation of souls for its object is always answered when it possesses the necessary qualities"; and, by a divine inspiration, he made known to her in an inexplicable manner, what had taken place at the death of Madame Cohen. She saw as in a vision the dying Jewess about to draw her latest breath, while Mary the Mother of Divine grace, prostrate before her Son, claimed that soul as her own. She saw grace from the Heart of Jesus leave its source, and touch the heart of the dying woman; and heard the last cry of her soul, "Jesus, God of the Christian, God Whom my son adores, I believe, I hope in Thee, have mercy upon me!" And as she uttered these words, her spirit fled. So was the prediction of the Curé d'Ars accomplished—a circumstance remarkable in itself even were the contents of the letter unimportant or unworthy of credence.

The peculiar circumstances of his conversion, no less than his former renown as a musician and his present eloquence as a preacher, made Père Hermann much sought after as missionary and preacher; and ill and suffering as he always was, sometimes obliged entirely to lie by, and at others, emerging from his sick-room merely to conduct some retreat or effect some unlooked-for conversion, and then retire again for further suffering "*toujours très souffrant en mon cerveau et de mes nerfs*," as he writes, "*et ces souffrances ne sont pas les moindres de mes joies*," he yet passed a great—we may say the greater part of his life as a religious in active apostolic labors. Truly apostolic, for as he himself remarked, his vocation seemed, like that of St. Paul, to be that of planting while others watered. Besides the Lyons foundation, to which we have referred, he built the church and installed the Père Carmes of Bagnères de Bigorne in the following manner: Mère Marie des Anges, prioress and founder of a Carmelite convent there, had longed for years for the establishment of a monastery from which her nuns might receive the spiritual advantages of the near neighborhood of religious directors living under the same rule as themselves. Père Hermann, who was sent to Bagnères by his physician for medical treatment at the then much-frequented baths there, learned her desire, and immediately

saw how advantageous a position it would be for his harvest of souls, being frequented in the summer by thousands of visitors as a health resort. Aided by some generous donations, he began the work. In three years' time the magnificent church was completed, and proved a source of blessing to many and many a soul. The Bagnérais still tell of how, in those palmy days of their now deserted town, the Carmelite church was ever thronged with a fashionable, yet devout, congregation, crowding to hear the once famous pianist Hermann as he preached at vesper hour and then retired to send forth solemn chords on the splendid organ, made by one of the first manufacturers of the day, Cavaillê & Col; while the bell-like notes of a hardly less famous tenor, who had followed Père Hermann into the cloister, rang through the echoing aisles. All this is silent now; frescoes painted, or at least begun by Horace Vernet, as an act of friendly homage to Père Hermann; statues, fresh from the hand of Bonassieu the sculptor; the simple grandeur of altars, confessionals ever crowded, from which none were ever sent away, all are now closed to the faithful. Not many months since, the writer, passing that melancholy gateway on which a faded wreath witnesses the death-blow given to faith in many a heart which might have knelt before those altars and received pardon, caught the faint sound of chanting within; and faithful women, lingering to listen, whispered: "It is the Fathers who sing their office—the feast of St. Teresa." So behind doors closed by the seal of the Republic, the house of the Lord awaits His re-entering. "Nothing has gone well with us since les Pères Carmes left," murmur the townsfolk, thinking of the day when, before a scared and silent crowd, the gendarmerie presented themselves before the monastery door, and "in the name of the Republic," the hands that had given bread to the hungry, the lips that had spoken consolation and pardon to the sinner, the feet that were ever ready to serve the sorrowful and the afflicted, were driven out like sheep into the wide world amid insult and scorn. The crowd murmured, especially the rude mountain shepherds who loved the good Fathers, and were indignant at their departure; but the officials threatened *artillery from Tarbes*, and they were cowed and silenced. The too pusillanimous inhabitants of the little town have even now reaped their reward in the almost total cessation of visitors to their baths. Its streets are deserted, shops empty or even closed, and the big casino, built to tempt the turning stream, has proved a failure.

But to return to Père Hermann. Perhaps one of the most thrilling scenes in his varied and eventful life, both to himself and to his auditors, was the hour when he first ascended the pulpit of St. Sulpice to preach by request before the Archbishop of Paris,

and a congregation composed of all that was most fashionable and intellectual alike in that city. For it was in Paris that he had formerly lived his public life as an artist; that he had taken his place in the concert-room with Liszt and Mario, and in the salons of literature and art with George Sand and La Mennais. It was the Parisian world which had first learned to smile indulgence on *le petit Puzzi*, or whisper wild stories and crazy anecdotes of the authoress and her darling. In fine, he had lived his unconverted life before the eyes of the world in Paris, and now, with the delicacy of a newly-awakened conscience, he felt deeply the need of reparation when he now once more, as a tonsured monk, stood before them. An immense crowd had gathered and filled every nook and corner of the church to hear the celebrated convert speak his first words as a Christian in their midst, and an audible murmur ran through that vast assembly as the white-cloaked monk lifted his grand yet humble brow, and with one keen glance round the expectant assembly, began to speak:

"My brethren, my first act on appearing in this Christian pulpit must be to make reparation for the scandal which, in the past, I had the misfortune to give in this city. You may well ask 'by what right do you come to preach to us, to exhort us to virtue, you whom we have seen among public sinners, prostrate in the pollution of shameless immorality, you who made open profession of error, you who have shocked our gaze by your ill-conduct,' 'Thou wast altogether born in sin, and dost thou teach?' Yes, brethren, I confess that I have sinned against heaven and before you, and that I have no right to your consideration. Therefore have I come clothed in the garb of penance, bound to an order of severity, with shaven head and bare feet," . . . here he recounted the history of his conversion, winding up with "God, my brethren, has forgiven me, Mary has forgiven me, . . . my brethren, will not you forgive me too?"

Then, turning to a group of young men, he reminded them that his life had been even as theirs, and opening his arms he implored them to follow him and share his happiness. At the close of his sermon he was followed from the church by a young artist, Bernard Bauer, till then unknown to him, who had lately renounced Judaism for Christianity, and now came to announce to Père Hermann that like himself he had "chosen the better part," and would follow him into the solitude of Carmel.

The order of discalced, or barefooted Carmelites, is divided into three branches; the religious who go forth as missionaries into heathen lands, the "mission strangers" of France; the ordinary Fathers who lead a semi-active, semi-contemplative life; and the hermit-brethren or inhabitants of the desert, modern representa-

tives of the Cenobites of old. One can scarcely realize that in the midst of our bustling nineteenth century any "deserts" should still exist capable of containing hermit life; yet we are assured that such is the case, and moreover that the Carmelite constitutions prescribe the formation of a hermitage "as far as possible one in each province." Their object is, as also there set forth, the practice of intercessory prayer, so that while others preach and fight and teach and gather in souls, their hermit-brethren offer up continually prayers, watches, penances and other good works, to be applied to their brethren. Here, too, the more active brethren may retire for a space to revivify their devotion and renew their strength; and of all the foundations and other works in which Père Hermann's hand was active, none was so near his heart as the "desert" which he helped to found, "*le saint desert de Tarasteix*." The property which contains it, a vast extent of undulating and well-wooded ground, was bought by Père Augustin on behalf of his Order in December, 1856, and from time to time he visited and watched its progress, tracing with his own hands the limits of its foundation, begging everywhere for funds, and overcoming by his energy a thousand obstacles which threatened its success.

An immense building, constructed on the Carthusian principle of separate dwellings under one roof, each habitation complete in itself, now crowns the highest of the little cluster of hills which forms "the desert;" their occupants happily peaceful in perpetual silence, perpetual solitude, and uninterrupted contemplation and prayer; while, scattered here and there among the surrounding woods, some humble huts receive those who crave after still more absolute loneliness.

But to return to the Cohen family. Our readers will remember the conversion of Madame R——, the dearly loved sister of Père Hermann, through the combined influence of himself and the good nun Mère Marie Pauline, and how she trembled at the thought of separation from her little George, her only child. Six years afterwards, his good uncle was enabled to write in full the history of a conversion as touchingly beautiful as that of any of the child confessors or martyrs of early Christian times.

When Madame R——, with her husband and child, went to Agen to visit her brother, that visit which ended in her reception into the Church, while the mother debated and argued over her doubts, her young son was, with something more than mere childish curiosity, examining with the keen interest of boyhood, what to him was a new and surprising phase of life. It was the time of the Fête-Dieu; a feast which in those days, under the Second Empire, little Christian perhaps, but at all events far different from the present infidel and persecuting times, was celebrated with all

the pageantry which Church and State together could offer in homage to the grand and solemn mystery of the Holy Eucharist. What stately festivities have we not witnessed, rich in waving banners and golden vestments, flower-decked streets and brilliant *repositoires*, the kneeling multitude constrained to at least external homage, while the presence of such regiments as might be stationed near added to the general effect! It is well that such things should be; that the world should in some degree be forced to worship its hidden King. Alas! it is only in remoter districts now that the old-time processions still retain anything of their ancient splendor. At Agen, then, while Madame R—— and her family stayed there, was celebrated the Fête Dieu, the Feast of Corpus Christi. Little George, we may suppose, had made the acquaintance of some boys of his own age in the town, for when the great procession of the feast, with its gaily decked *repositoires* and waving banners were about to traverse the crowded streets, he, by dint of who knows what childish persuasiveness or bribes, succeeded in inducing one of the choir boys of about his own height to lend him his red cassock and white cotta and to allow him to walk in the procession in his stead. Whether this was done from boyish sportiveness or dawning devotion we cannot tell; certain it is that on that day the seeds of faith were sown in his young heart. He ran home beaming with delight. "Oh, father, father!" he cried, "what happiness! Do you not know? I have been scattering flowers before the good God!"

It was a confession of faith, and the father, startled into alarm, vowed he would remain no longer in that dangerous place, and carried them all back hurriedly to Paris, little guessing that his wife had already been secretly received into the Christian Church. Children are proverbially keen observers, and little George soon began to remark that his mother was in some way changed. Although she dared not, even to her child, acknowledge herself a Christian, she talked much to him of heavenly things, and soon he learned from her lips the mysteries of the faith, while from the grace which had fallen on his soul through the presence of the Holy Eucharist he seemed to have reaped a spirit of devotion most marvellous in so young a child. His uncle tells us that he would wait until his father was asleep (he slept beside him) to rise and pray to the Holy Child Jesus. "Oh my Jesus," he would whisper, "when shall my fast be at an end, when shall I be able to receive Thee in Holy Communion and hold Thee to my heart?" And then he would study his little catechism so as to be quite ready when the longed-for hour should come. He was much perplexed at the change in his mother, and one day said to her: "Swear to me that you are not baptized, otherwise I shall believe that

you are!" She did not answer, and he continued: "Ah, mamma, I see, you *are* a Christian! And I hope that Jesus will soon unite me to you, but at least I hope that you have *waited for me* for your first Communion." The trembling mother could keep silence no longer; she whispered to her child that almost daily she received her Saviour. He burst into tears. "Oh, why not have waited for me? Then let me stay very close to you when Jesus is in your heart that I may be near Him. Darling mother, I beg you to keep for me something out of your Communion; you know a mother is always ready to share her own food with her children."

Poor child! Yet not poor, but rich in faith and love. For four long years he lived thus, with no other consolation than the companionship of his trembling mother, watching his little comrades in the Churches as they made their First Communion, and rejoiced in all the privileges of their Christian birth, so little understood sometimes, so little valued. Many would pass by the childish figure half hidden in a corner of his parish church where he would creep in to weep in secret and watch with hungry eyes some groups of white-robed First Communicants, little guessing at the source of his very obvious grief. At last he could bear it no longer—he declared to his mother that he would go and demand baptism from any priest he came across if she did not help him to become a Christian. So, after much deliberation, Père Hermann came up to Paris, secretly, and prepared to receive his little nephew into the Fold of Christ. It was a touching scene. The mother, trembling and agitated, fearing lest her husband should discover them; the witnesses, grave and interested; the uncle-priest by whose prayers this new lamb had been led to its Shepherd; and the child himself, calm, joyous, collected, kneeling in their midst.

"Child, what do you ask?"

"Baptism."

"But know you not, my child, that to-morrow perchance you may be forced to enter a synagogue and participate in its worship?"

"Do not fear, uncle, I abjure Judaism."

"But if they should threaten you and force you to trample on the Crucifix in hatred of our Redemption?"

"Do not be afraid, uncle, I will die rather than do it. Only," he continued anxiously, "if they should tie my feet and hands and carry me into the synagogue and place my feet upon the Crucifix, would that be apostasy, if my will resisted?"

"No, my child, it is the will only which constitutes sin."

"Then I demand baptism. In pity, in pity, give it to me!"

The ceremony continued amid profound emotion. First the Sacrament of Baptism, then Holy Mass and then his First Com-

munion, kneeling between mother and godmother, but unconscious of them and the whole world, rapt in an ecstasy of holy joy.

Some weeks afterwards came the hour of trial. His father, who doubtless had had his suspicions roused, put a Jewish prayer-book into his hands and said to him: "Let us pray."

"Father, I cannot pray in this book of Israelites."

"Why?"

"I am a Christian, I am a Catholic!"

"Child, you are playing, not talking seriously; you know quite well that your 'baptism' would not be valid without your father's consent!"

"I beg your pardon, father, in our holy religion it suffices to be at a reasonable age and have faith and instruction to be validly baptized."

His father said no more for the moment, but a few days later he took George away from his mother and disappeared with him. It was what she had dreaded from the first. Every effort was made by her friends, civil and political authority freely used to discover the place to which the child had been taken, but in vain. Long afterwards it was known that he had been taken into a Protestant country, and there, hundreds of miles away, placed in a heretic school under an assumed name. Here, as he wept and begged to see his mother, "You shall see her," they answered, "if you will first abjure Christianity." "Oh no," replied the sobbing child again and again, "I am a Christian; I am a Catholic; I will suffer anything rather than give up my faith."

So he stood firm; yet his jailers, with a refinement of cruelty, wrote to the mother that he had returned to Judaism.

Three months passed thus; the mother alone, anxious and sorrowful, having for consolation only her daily communion. The child, still more desolate, deprived of all means of grace, far away in a foreign land. At last a letter came from Germany summoning her to her son. She hastened to the address indicated, a long and toilsome journey, and found her family awaiting her, but—no George! "My son, where is my son?" she cried. "You will not see your son until you take an oath to bring him up a Jew," was the reply. A few weeks later, however, her husband so far relented as to allow her few minutes sight of her boy, in his presence, on the express condition that no word on the subject of religion should be uttered. The interview was sad, yet sweet to her heart. Little George threw himself into his mother's arms with sobs and tears, and she clasped him silently to her heart. "He was not able to tell me anything," she wrote to her brother, "but I understood, I felt, that he remained faithful. Yes, I read in his looks, in his tender kisses, that my boy is still a Christian."

From this time apparently Madame R—— continued to reside in the same town where her son was at school, and they met occasionally. "He has found his mother, but where will he find his Jesus?" writes Père Hermann, referring to the fact that in all that town there was not a single Catholic Church or priest who could, even if it had been otherwise possible, have brought little George the consolation of the Sacraments. But God would not leave the heroic young confessor desolate. One day as he was playing by himself in a neighboring wood, where he had, perhaps designedly, strayed from his companions, a stranger gentleman, grave yet kindly of mien, chanced to cross his path. They stop, with mutual looks of inquiry and recognition. "You are George R——?" he queries; and then tells him that he is a missionary priest in disguise, sent by Madame R—— to help and comfort her child.

The happy boy is at last able to make his long-deferred confession, and drink in the words of consolation and encouragement so lovingly proffered. But about Holy Communion? Yes, this too is promised; and they plan and arrange, and pray that all may go well; and a few days later the same good priest, bearing concealed upon his person the Sacred Host and disguised as before, crosses again the Elbe in a crowded excursion steamer, and going to Madame R——'s house where, in her own room she had managed to make a little altar with flowers and lights, he found there the son with his mother, and gave him thus his Easter Communion.

As the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church, so the constancy of her confessors is her most fruitful Apostolate; and not long after the persecution to which little George had been subjected was relaxed, one of his mother's brothers presented himself to be received into the Christian Church, saying to his brother Hermann that "a religion which gives such strength to a child must be divine, and that is the reason why I wish to become a Catholic." His elder brother had already become a Christian, and had borne almost the entire expense of erecting a church at Hambourg, where he was baptized; but the father remained bitter against the Church, and in the first outburst of his wrath against Hermann had cursed and disinherited him. One is glad to learn that he consented to forgive and see him on his death-bed, and though dying as he had lived, a Jew, was able to say as he pressed his son's hand in a last farewell, "I forgive thee the three great faults of thy life; having become a Catholic, converted thy sister, and baptized thy nephew!"

In 1855, while Père Augustin-Marie was preaching the Advent sermons at the Cathedral of Lyons, he received an offer from a rich silk merchant, one who had risen from the position of

simply a workman to the head of the trade, of 10,000 francs as a "foundation stone," if his Order would establish a branch in that city. The offer was accepted, and we have seen Père Augustin, with his Semitic brethren, at the ceremony of consecration. It was but one of many like works; for, during the thirty years of his religious life he who so loved and yearned after solitude lived a life of literally incessant movement, going from one place to another, north, south, east, west; here to preach a mission, there to give a retreat, or beg for funds for some new foundation or work of charity. Some one who met him—where indeed he was constantly seen—at a railway station, asked him in all seriousness:

"But, Father, where do you reside?"

"In the train," he answered with a smile; and truly such a life was not the least part of his penance. He was said to divide his life between the train and the pulpit—he, whose one longing had ever been to pray out his life in his beloved desert, the solitude of Tarasteix. But, as the holy Curé d' Ars had prophesied to him, "You do well, indeed, to help in founding a desert, but you will profit little by it yourself." The inhabitants of Lyons, hard-headed men of business and "red" republicans as they were, seem to have been enthusiastically, almost passionately, devoted to him, and his influence among them was unbounded. When he stayed there, the people would throw themselves on their knees as he passed, to ask his blessing, so that he dreaded, in his humility, to go out on foot. One day, having to go some distance, he took a *voiture de place*, and kept it for several hours, going from place to place. When he came to pay his fare on alighting at the convent, "*Pay me, Father?*" cried the driver indignantly, "No, never! Give me your blessing, and I shall be happy!" And not a sou would the good man accept.

Over and over again he was brought to the death-bed of some unrepentant sinner, whose blasphemies were turned, by one word from his lips, into tears of penitence.

In 1879 he established the "Confraternity of Thanksgiving" already alluded to, which in very few years numbered 20,000 Associates, and was enriched by Pius IX. with many indulgences. It is said that he presented so long a list of these, that the Pontiff with his well-known gaiety exclaimed, "But, Father, you are asking for *half Paradise!*" "Holy Father, you hold the keys of it!" responded Hermann with gentle insistence. And he obtained his indulgences.

On a later visit to Rome, in 1862, he met Cardinal Wiseman there, and this dignitary was so struck with Père Augustin's marvellous apostolic gifts, that he begged of the Superior General of

the Carmelites to lend him to the English Mission. The General refused, the Cardinal appealed to the Pope, and Hermann was sent to England. On bidding him farewell the Pontiff exclaimed "My son I bless you and send you to convert England as in the fifth century one of my predecessors blessed and sent the monk Augustin." When he left Paris to enter upon his mission to England, he is described as being, like the first Apostles, "without cloak or raiment or money in his purse"; he literally had no money to pay his journey, and was obliged to beg for some from his friends to enable him to start. He raised, literally by begging, 160 francs, and with this he went to London to re-introduce the Carmelite order.

In the days of his artistic celebrity he had been well-known in the great world of London; and the rumor soon went that Hermann the converted pianist had arrived. People flocked to hear him, crowded to visit him, and by degrees subscriptions for the new church were set on foot. The first little band of monks came together in a house belonging to the Assumption Convent in Kensington, where a small room, converted into a chapel, became the nucleus of wide-spread labors. He preached in English, confessed in German, catechised the children of the neighborhood and gave retreats to the clergy of the diocese, and introduced his beloved "Adoration Nocturne."

Some of our readers may remember the beautiful story of St. Catherine of Siena and the young knight whom by her prayers and exhortations she converted and accompanied to the scaffold, placing his head with her own hands under the knife. "I knelt by his side, and reminded him of the Blood of the spotless Lamb. His lips murmured the words 'Jesus and Catherine.' Then the knife fell, and I received his head in my hands." The story has been immortalized in painting by the hand of Pinturichio, but no nineteenth-century artist has yet attempted to portray a companion picture—that of Hermann the monk on a like scaffold.

One day—it was in 1864—eight Spanish sailors, imprisoned in Newgate, were condemned to death for murder at sea. Père Hermann, together with one of his brothers, the master of novices, who was a Spaniard, was called upon to give them spiritual assistance, and for fifteen days they visited them daily. Finally, three were reprieved and five condemned to the gallows, four of whom were Catholics; and Père Hermann afterwards in a speech before the Conference at Malines, gave a thrilling description of their last moments. He told how, after fifteen days of loving, earnest pleading, these poor souls had been touched with the grace of repentance, and from raging demons became transformed into most humble penitents. On the morning of the execution

he passed through a crowd of 30,000 men and women, who had stationed themselves the whole night through before that terrible gallows to see their fellow-men die, bearing concealed upon his breast the Holy Eucharist. "Never, in all my thirteen years of priesthood," he declared, "have I so strikingly seen exemplified the efficacious power of the Eucharist and the priesthood. For two long hours those young souls—the eldest was not more than 26 years old, talked—as they waited for the moment of death, with the sounds of howling and hooting outside breaking ever and anon upon their ears—of the joys and glories of Paradise, of the love of God and of the forgiveness of Jesus—till the grim procession of officials appeared to conduct them to the scaffold. One last grace they requested, "to have our priests beside us to the end," and, contrary to prison rules, this was granted them. Père Hermann and his brother priest, like St. Catherine of old, mounted the scaffold beside the row of pinioned criminals, who had to face not only the supreme terror of the gallows, but also that almost more unnerving sight, the sea of 30,000 upturned, expectant, pitiless human faces, all eager to see a fellow-man meet his doom. "Father, Father," cried one of them, "do not forsake me!" "And I stepped up to the fatal plank," said Père Hermann, "expecting a howl of execration at the sight of a Catholic priest and of rosaries and crucifixes with which they were armed. But no; 'Hats off!' was the only cry; and as they stood there, one of the condemned ones wrenching asunder the ropes which bound his arms, lifted his right hand full in view and blessed himself on forehead, lips, and heart, then beating his breast three times he cried out *the only English word he knew*, "Pardon! Pardon! Pardon!" A murmur of sympathy ran through the crowd—the sheriff made a sign—and the next moment all was over. The Spanish priest who accompanied Père Hermann was forced to detach his own crucifix from the lips of one of the criminals as the drop fell, so closely did they accompany these penitents. It was afterwards remarked—and recorded in the *Times* newspaper—that the faces of four out of the five—and they were the four Catholics—were, contrary to the general result of such death, calm, peaceful, almost smiling. "Their very bodies," commented Père Hermann, "were as it were embalmed by the Blessed Eucharist."

The record of Père Augustin's apostolic labors at this time becomes almost bewildering in the rapidity of his movements. One day he is in London gathering worshipers round the Blessed Sacrament, the next in Berlin giving Holy Communion, at the close of a retreat, to more than seven thousand persons; again at Lyons for a Triduum, at Rouen, Rennes, Paris, Passay le Monial, Ireland, Rome; everywhere sermons, retreats, missions without end, in spite of weak health and almost constant suffering.

"Only fancy," writes Soeur Natalie Marischkin in a letter given in Mrs. Craven's charming life of her, "for a fortnight we have had Father Hermann here. You have heard of his conversion in 1847, but if you only knew how strongly and continually grace works in his soul you would join us in thanking God for it. My dear companions are electrified and penetrated by the perfume of his virtues. . . . This Father's presence has done us great good; one cannot help being the better for coming into contact with his ardent charity. The impressions he leaves behind him are quite peculiar." He on his side declared that "she was one of the most beautiful souls in the Church," but neither of them guessed as they thus mutually edified each other that it was a Sister of her own Order, that of St. Vincent de Paul, who was ere long to minister to him upon his death-bed in exile and receive his latest breath.

At last he found himself at liberty to fulfil what had had been for many years the desire of his heart—to retire to "the holy desert of Tarasteix, the ante-chamber of heaven." It was entered with much ceremony, a reception almost like that of profession to the religious life; and once admitted the soul which yearned for solitary and uninterrupted converse with its God might well hope to be "forgotten by the world." But in his case such was not to be. The strain of overwork in the past now took effect, and brought on a serious ophthalmic affection which necessitated special treatment; and after consulting the physicians, under obedience, he resolved to try rather supernatural than natural means, and went to Lourdes to ask for a cure. After a novena at his own convent of Bagnere de Bigorne, he crossed, on foot, the quiet mountain pass which leads from the valley of Bagneres to that smiling plain, gently undulating on either side of the rushing Gave where nestles the quiet country townlet which has become the centre of a world-wide pilgrimage; and bathing in the healing waters beside the Grotto, he rose from his knees to echo the cry of many another pilgrim heart, "*Je suis gueri!*"

It was not, as we may well imagine, his first visit to Lourdes. Long years before, when the Grotto was guarded by soldiers, and Bernadette an object of suspicion, he had prayed there and received the grace of release from a troublesome neuralgic affection, and had congratulated the inhabitants with his usual warm fervor on their present blessedness and future glories; and watched, with paternal interest, the holy retirement of the favored peasant girl, and the growth of devotion to Our Lady under her new title, she in whose own mouth he had received the grand first grace of conversion, and "through whom" as he wrote, "he had found Jesus."

Again, after his cure, for a brief while he returned to his beloved desert, but the holy soul who had revealed to him his mother's dying conversion, now sent him a second message: "Tell Père Hermann that he may not remain in the desert, he must fight." And presently the order came to return to active life as First Definitor of the Province and Master of Novices.

For he was to die in harness. It was the year 1870 which first saw him ruling the novitiate at Broussey, and in the autumn of that year came Sedan, and Metz, and all the horrors and hatreds of war. Hermann Cohen was a German by birth, and though privileged to remain in the land of his adoption, he feared to compromise his brethren by his presence among them at a time when convents were pillaged and monasteries razed for slighter cause; so, resigning his post with the heroic unselfishness which ever characterized him, he paid one last visit to his well-loved desert, and to his foundations, Bagneres and Carcassonne, and then passed on into Switzerland, the refuge of political fugitives, warmly welcomed by its chief pastor, Monsignor Mermillod.

This venerable prelate, true patriot as well as zealous lover of souls, was just at that time grieving over the sad condition of hundreds of French soldiers who, imprisoned in German fortresses, suffered grievously both in body and soul. They were not permitted to see a priest of their own nation, and the thought came like an inspiration to Monsignor Mermillod, "Suppose Pere Hermann, a German by birth, a Frenchman in heart and soul, well known at Berlin and personally acquainted with the Queen of Prussia, were to offer his services?" Hermann accepted the suggestion, set off for Berlin, and placing his services at the disposal of the authorities, was nominated chaplain of the fortress of Spandau, near the capital, where 6000 French prisoners were interned. What his labors were here those only who know the heart of an apostle can fathom; how night and day he was among them, bringing comfort to their bodies and healing to their souls; how he preached, confessed, communicated them in ceaseless iteration, procured warm clothing for their suffering bodies, and preached penitence to their souls. It was not for long. Among the sick no less than 300 in the hospital were laid low under the scourge of small-pox. Worn out with labors and weakened by incessant strain, the weary frame was open to infection, and in administering the Sacrament of Extreme Unction to two dying men he caught the disease. A neighboring priest was summoned to his bedside and expressed the hope that God would yet spare him to his work. "Well, *no*," he replied, clasping his crucifix with weak and trembling fingers. "I hope that God will take me this time."

"Yet I should have liked," he murmured some days later, "to

work on and gain more souls for Jesus." It was his only regret. Later in the same evening he received his viaticum, blessed, with dying breath, the nursing Sisters who ministered to him; "And now, oh, my God, into Thy Hands I commend my spirit;" a few hours of fainter and fainter breathing, and his noble, tender soul had entered his Master's Presence.

Sœur Natalie gave, in writing to one of her correspondents, a beautiful account of his last moments. "I longed to tell you what we have heard of the last moments of the saintly Father Hermann. One of our Sisters had the privilege of ministering to him during his illness and witnessing his end. When he felt that he was dying, he asked her if she could sing the 'Te Deum.' 'No, she could not.' 'And the Salve Regina?' 'Oh, yes,' she replied. 'Then let us sing it together;' and he began the antiphon with her. As they went on with it the voice of the dying saint became weaker and weaker, and then ceased to be heard—he was dead. Oh, what an end, dear Sister! If ever I was tempted to the sin of envy, it was from the wish to have been in that privileged Sister's place!"

THEODORA L. L. TEELING.

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS.

NO. 2. THE PROPHECY—THE OFFER—THE ACCEPTANCE.

WHILE the studies of Columbus were chiefly of a scientific character, the motives which impelled him to undertake the discovery of the New World were chiefly religious. The extension of the realms of Christendom, the conversion of the heathen natives to Christianity, the exaltation of the Saviour's name on earth and the spread of the Church, were the grand objects he aimed to accomplish. When success crowned his gigantic efforts, and boundless revenues were his due, the other sublime purpose of restoring the Holy Sepulchre and the Holy Lands to the Christians, became the paramount object of his burning thoughts, desires and sacrifices. Having been from childhood and through life a devout and earnest Christian, he was well acquainted with Christian interests, duties and dogmas. But when he felt his providential and apostolic mission developing in his mind and heart, he devoted himself with extraordinary industry, zeal and enthusiasm, to the study of the Scriptures, the history of the Church, the dogmas of Christianity, Christian Philosophy and Theology, and Christian civilization. These chastening studies prepared him for his great mission, and when he came to plead the cause of the New World in the Council of Salamanca, composed chiefly of ecclesiastics and greatly less of navigators and mariners, he seemed like a prophet in the flesh by reason of his ecclesiastical, scriptural and sacred learning and by the power of his arguments and eloquence. So, also, when between his third and fourth voyages, he pleaded with the Spanish sovereigns the cause of the Holy Sepulchre, the wisest and most learned theologians and divines could add nothing to his sublime knowledge and application of the prophecies, the gospels and the patristic theology. He boldly asserted that his double mission had been foretold in the divine prophecies. He felt this inspiration through many years of his life, long before he presented it in public in connection with the proposals he made for the discovery of the New World, and he defended his position with the learning of a seer, the inspiration of a prophet, and the zeal of an apostle.

Many learned divines have maintained, with Columbus, that his mission and its results were foretold by the Prophets, and many texts of Scripture are referred to as indicating or pointing to the great discoverer. It has been claimed that in the Holy Scriptures

no less than nine different passages are distinctly applicable to the discovery of the New World by Columbus, and many have admirably seen in Holy Writ descriptions of his ships and even of his armorial ensigns. While Cardinal Ximenes, who acted as intermediary between the admiral's son and successor, Don Diego Columbus and the Emperor Charles V., evinced appreciation of his divine mission, the able and pious Diego de Deza, Archbishop of Seville, supported the pretensions of the admiral, publicly and privately. The illustrious Cardinal Valerio, in his great work "*De Consolatione Ecclesiæ*," seems by the strongest implication to venerate and praise the providential character of the man. The Count Roselly de Lorgues names a long list of eminent historical and religious personages, including Maluenda, Thomas Bozius, Ponce de Leon, Bolera, Father Thomas of Jesus, Solerzano Herrera, who espoused the same view. The learned Father Acosta sees in numerous passages of the prophet Isaias direct references to the discovery of America, especially in the sixty-sixth chapter. It would be impossible to recount the numerous opinions, and still less the countless passages, which have been thus regarded and quoted. A selection of the 18th, 19th, 20th, 21st, 22d, and 23d verses of the 66th chapter of Isaias referring to the call of the Gentiles, will suffice as curious examples, among many others :

"18. But I know their works, and their thoughts; *I come that I may gather them together with all nations and tongues; and they shall come and shall see my glory.*

"19. And I will set a *sign among them*, and I will send them, *that shall be saved, to the Gentiles into the sea, into Africa and Lydia, them that draw the bow; into Italy and Greece, to the islands afar off, to them that have not heard of me, and have not seen my glory. And they shall declare my glory to the Gentiles.*

"20. *And they shall bring all your brethren out of all nations for a gift to the Lord*, upon horses and in chariots, and in litters, and on mules, and in coaches, to my holy mountain Jerusalem, saith the Lord, as if the children of Israel should bring an offering in a clean vessel unto the house of the Lord.

"21. *And I will take of them to be priests and Levites*, saith the Lord.

"22. *For as the new heavens, and the new earth, which I make to stand before me*, saith the Lord; so shall your seed stand and your name.

"23. And there shall be month after month, and Sabbath after Sabbath, *and all flesh shall come to adore before my face saith the Lord.*"

While there are many other passages of the scriptures which equally refer to great events to take place in the future, such as

the inhabitants of the islands and lands of the Gentiles, and to the heathens coming to know and worship the true God, and which are susceptible of a construction pointing to the discovery of the New World, these were all sedulously sought out and carefully collated by Christopher Columbus, and he used them with wonderful effect and admirable skill, in vindicating his theories, in establishing his divine call, and in proving the truth of his predictions.

But there was a tradition, of Christian origin, whose author is unknown, whose source is involved in obscurity, and whose date cannot be fixed, and yet it was regarded as, and has since been cited, by the biographers of Columbus, as proof of the prophetic character he bears in history, and of the prophetic achievements he was to perform. The very name, the symbolism and the office of Columbus were thus presented and handed down in tradition, in the hagiography and martyrology of the Church, in sacred statues and pictures, and in the most splendid window-pictures of the Cathedrals of the Middle Ages. A colossal saint is thus represented in legend, in prayer, and in architecture, whose name was St. Christopher, and whose office was to bear the Christ on his powerful shoulders across the vast waters. St. Christopher was the patronal saint of Columbus. It is true his name appears in the ancient hagiology of the Church, in her martyrology, and Alban Butler gives the sacred tradition. The pagan name of the saint was Orphurus; he was by birth a Syrian, of gigantic strength and stature, and zealous in the service of the powerful king. He became a Christian instantly on witnessing a Christian miracle, and such was his zeal that he insisted upon receiving no other name than Christophorus, the Christ-Bearer, when he received baptism at the hands of St. Babylus, Bishop of Antioch. He carried the Gospel through Palestine, parts of Asia Minor, and travelled constantly, preaching the Word. He was finally arrested during the persecution, under the Emperor Decius, and sealed his faith and services with his blood. The variance between the life and deeds of St. Christopher and the symbolical forms under which he was represented, has attracted much attention. Those symbols represented a Christ-Bearer carrying the Christ over vast seas of water, and they have thus represented the name rather than the deeds of the Syrian martyr. The name and the office have thus been symbolized, and not the life or deeds of the giant saint. The symbols describe in fact the divine vocation, the office and the very achievements of Christopher Columbus, in discovering America, and thus carrying the Christ across a mighty ocean to distant heathen nations. The very resoluteness of Columbus, his indomitable will, his power and strength of argument, conviction, and learning, his gigantic per-

severance under unparalleled delays, obstacles and opposition, point to him through the symbols of St. Christopher. Such, too, was the representation of the saint, from the beginning, even from the fourth century. Thus says the Count Roselly de Lorgues; "The Church welcomed the colossal effigies of St. Christopher, which, in rendering homage to the giant martyr of the Faith, represented the future apostolate of a great man, who would bear 'Christ' in his very name," and we may add who would carry Christ across the vast wilderness of waters to many nations, and as Isaias proclaimed for the Lord, "to them that have not heard of me, and have not seen my glory."

It is also a quite authentic and historical fact, that from the time of the appearance and eminence attained by Christopher Columbus, and his discovery of the New World, the representations of St. Christopher became very much altered. Instead of the colossal saint, the proportions were reduced very much in size, and made to correspond with the probable proportions of Christopher Columbus. It is also interesting to note that in one of the first maps of the New World, perhaps the very first, made, too, by the first geographer contemporaneous with the great discovery, the celebrated Juan de la Cosa, he omitted to place on his map the name of Christopher Columbus as the discoverer of the new countries thus delineated; but in place thereof he painted on the map a representation of St. Christopher, bearing Christ on his shoulders, and in the opinion of M. Ferdinand Denis and of the Count de Lorgues, the features and countenance of the saint were those of Columbus. The latter of these writers argues closely that the images of St. Christopher were only prophetic of Columbus, and that "the prediction contained in this religious image was already realized." The disappearance of St. Christopher now from our churches and cathedrals, the cessation of new dedications in his honor, and the discontinuance of his *cultus*, while the glory and honor of the great admiral and discoverer have reached their height, would indicate the natural order of events, the prophecy replaced by its fulfilment. But St. Christopher, the colossal saint, had been generally venerated in Spain, and it is a significant and curious fact, that from the twelfth century, and perhaps an earlier one, there was a tradition that the very country from which Christopher Columbus went forth with the cross, Catholic Spain, should be the country that was destined to convert the nations that should be discovered. It was Christopher Columbus himself who, after his third voyage, and while pleading for his fourth, sought out and revived this prophetic tradition, in his "Book of Prophecies." Father Acosta, in his "Natural and Moral History of the Indies," has said, with true antiquarian research, "that it had been predicted

for a long time that the New World was to be converted to Jesus Christ by the Spanish nation." Who can say that Columbus had not reason to believe that he and his work had been foretold by prophet and tradition? But ancient and modern poetry had also spoken in even more emphatic terms. In classic Greece and Rome the gift of poetry, with its great scope and liberty, was little removed from the gift of oracles and prophecy, and the oracles of Delphi were issued in the poetic literary form. At all events the poet could safely take the uncertain risk, and if his predictions were verified, he was recognized as a prophet; but if it eventuated otherwise, the thoughts were referred to the poet's license to roam at will in the realms of fancy. And yet, for some purpose of its own, Divine Providence might have bestowed, as in the case of the Sibyl, a prophetic Gift upon the Gentile poet. If, as Columbus and many learned scholars thought, the words of Isaias and other prophets referred to the coming discovery of a New World, and the mystic meaning was left to human ingenuity or genius to detect and interpret, so, too, the classic poet and philosopher, the learned Seneca, of the first half of the first century of the Christian Era, has foretold the discovery of America in verses of no doubtful meaning:

" Venient annis
Sæcula seris, quibus Oceanus
Vincula rerum laxet, et ingens
Pateat Tellus, Typhisque novos
Delegat orbis, nec sit terris
Ultima Thule."—Seneca's *Medea*.

Mr. Joshua Tallman Smith has given us a free translation of the prophecy:

" Naught now its ancient place retains;
Araxes' banks the Indian gains;
The Persian, Elbe and Rhine hath found,
Far from his country's ancient bound,
And ages yet to come shall see
Old Ocean's limits passed and free,
Where lands, wide-stretched, beyond our view lie
Remoter than remotest Thule."

A clearer conception of the poet's mind may be gathered from the following translation of the same:

An age in the dim distant future
Shall the bonds of the Ocean unbind;
Shall open up Earth to its limits,
And Continents new shall it find,
When Ultima Thule has left
But a name or a record behind.

Even the divine Dante became inspired with prophetic sight when he contemplated the possibilities of the earth, and thus, about two centuries before Columbus' great discovery, predicted what would happen :

De' vostri sensi, ch'e de rimanente,
Non vogliate negar l'esperienza,
Dietro al Sol, del Mondo senza gente.
—Dante's *Inferno*, canto 26, v. 115.

These lines have been happily translated by Mr. Carey, the translator of Dante, as follows :

" O brothers, who amid a hundred thousand
Perils," I said, " have come unto the West,
To this so inconsiderable vigil
Which is remaining of your senses still,
Be ye unwilling to deny the knowledge,
Following the sun, of the unpeopled world ?"

But another poet who flourished in the very century of Columbus, his contemporary in part, though he did not live to know of the discovery of America, Pulci, of Florence, born in 1431 and deceased in 1487, has, in poetic form, given the world of that century an insight into the coming discovery ; a prophecy which, no doubt, fell under the vigilant eye of the man that fulfilled it. The poet puts the words this time in the mouth of the devil, who is answering Rinaldo, and refuting the general belief that the world ended at the Pillars of Hercules :

" Know that this theory is false ; his bark
The daring mariner shall urge far o'er
The western wave, a smooth and level plain,
Albeit the Earth is fashioned like a wheel.
Man was in ancient days of grosser mould,
And Hercules might blush to know how far
Beyond the limits he had vainly set
The dullest sea-boat soon shall wing her way.
Men shall descry another hemisphere,
Since to one common centre all things tend ;
So Earth, by curious mystery divine
Well balanced, hangs amid the starry spheres.
At our antipodes are cities, states,
And thronged empires, ne'er divined of yore.
But see, the Sun speeds on his western path
To glad the nations with expected light."
—*Morgante Maggiore*, Prescott's Translation.

Here, in these remarkable and spirited words of the poet-prophet we find settled and elucidated with ease and grandeur of conception, the then difficult and abstruse questions which afterwards so much disconcerted the learned Council of Salamanca. The spheri-

city of the earth, the centre of gravity, the antipodes, the hemispheres, continents studded with cities, states and empires, are all described, and the little caravel on board of which Columbus sailed and saw or experienced them all, was "the dullest sea-boat" which the conscious poet predicted would make the fateful voyage. That Columbus carefully sought out and studied every work, every allusion in books, charts and traditions, which in any way bore upon the great subject of his aspirations, is one of the most marked features of his progress towards conviction and confidence. No doubt many passages other than those above mentioned, and many sources of information, were explored by him. He was thoroughly and immovably convinced of the existence of western lands unknown to the civilized world. While all eyes were turned on the African route to the Indies, it was a brave and sublime effort of genius by which Columbus asserted that the New World would be reached by sailing westward across the Atlantic. It was not only the voice of prophetic seers that brought conviction to his mind, and gave great shape to his theories and proposals; it was also, and chiefly, on scientific and practical bases, that he built the splendid structure of his startling announcement. Hence it was, that when Columbus made known his views and proposals, and was challenged with every conceivable and inconceivable objection and defiance, he was well prepared to give the grounds upon which he based them.

First of all he supported his theories upon physical reasons. The evident and demonstrable sphericity of the earth, foreshadowed, as Mr. Winsor says, from a period of six hundred years before Christ by a few leading philosophers, and the consequent existence of the antipodes he firmly asserted. From such data it was manifest that a ship could sail *around* the earth. Measuring the circumference of the earth at twenty-four hours or three hundred and sixty degrees with Ptolemy, and proving by comparison map that fifteen hours of this measurement were known, there remained but eight hours, or one-third of the circumference to be discovered. This space must be filled by the Eastern regions of Asia, and a strip of ocean, which, leaning upon learned authorities, he contended was inconsiderable, could be easily traversed, and thus by sailing westward the lands of Asia must be found. He secondly supported his claim upon the authority of such writers as Aristotle, Seneca, Pliny and Strabo, among the ancients, and of Marco Polo and Sir John Mandeville among moderns, and having read from them that Eastern Asia must be opposite Spain and Africa, and a course, taking in Antillia and Cipango, opulent Eastern islands, would easily result in finding Asia. His third argument rested on the reports of experienced navigators. Many signs of the existence of

land westward across the Atlantic had floated to the shores of Europe and Africa, and his memoranda contain many such reports from mariners employed in the Portuguese voyages on the coast of Africa, and from the inhabitants of the Canaries, Madeira, and the Azores. In one instance a piece of carved wood was picked up four hundred and fifty leagues west of Cape St. Vincent, and at Porto Santo a similar token had been drifted ashore from the western Atlantic; huge trunks of pine trees were drifted ashore from the same direction, and even the bodies of two dead men with features different from any known race, were washed ashore on the island of Flores. Many veteran seamen had seen lands and islands to the westward when carried by winds in that direction out of their course. Even the king of Portugal had shown him some gigantic reeds from far off lands. These and innumerable instances and proofs under all three heads were ever ready in his memory for his use in demonstration of his positions. The philosophical grounds, based upon the shape of the earth, its size in hours of fifteen degrees and the consequent size of the land and ocean intervening, furnished his principal argument, and these, though based upon two errors of fact as to the extent of Asia and the surface of intervening ocean, were substantially correct. Mr. Irving considers these as fortunate errors, since by diminishing the distance to be navigated he gave hope of success. Whereas had it been known how much larger was the earth's circumference, and how much vaster the intervening ocean, Columbus could never have induced a government to undertake the task, or a mariner to sail with him. The peculiar manner and gradual succession of his accumulation of proofs show conclusively that he had long been convinced of his theory, and that he had spent many years in thus heaping up proofs to support it. From the first announcement of his theory he spoke with the firmness and certainty of a seer, and he would not concede a point to doubting opponents. Not only was he thoroughly equipped with every weapon of science, tradition and authority, but he came forward prophet-like, imbued with deep religious convictions that he was a chosen emissary of Providence and that Holy Writ and Oracle had equally foretold his mission. Now were the ages gathered together and accomplished, the time long prophesied had come, the man of destiny was girded for the task, and the peoples that had never known the Lord would now see Him and know Him, and adore. It has well been contended by authors with almost universal acclaim, that the idea originated solely in the mind of Columbus, and Mr. Irving with singular ability traces its origin and progress there, and proves that it was a conception of his genius, only quickened by

the impulse of his age and encouraged by a few scattered gleams of knowledge which had never produced a sharpened conviction or even a defined theory in the minds of men. It has remained for Mr. Winsor of Boston to assume that Columbus only executed what had for five hundred years before Christ been handed down among the learned as a definite theory.

The next great event in the life and progress of Columbus was his correspondence with the famous and learned cosmographer of Florence, Dr. Paolo Toscanelli, which occurred in the year 1474. Having heard that Dr. Toscanelli was corresponding with Lorenzo Girardi, a Florentine, then in Lisbon, on the subject of the Portuguese voyages along the African coast towards Asia, and the possibility of western voyages for the same end, circumstances which show that Columbus had long before this been convinced of his Western plan, and had freely spoken of it in Lisbon, Columbus sent to the learned cosmographer a small globe showing the shape of the earth, and especially his views. He addressed two letters to the distinguished cosmographer of Florence, both of which have been unfortunately lost, but the two letters of Dr. Toscanelli to Columbus have fortunately been preserved. It would be interesting to give them at length, in order that we might see, now, at the close of the nineteenth century and four hundred years after the great discovery, how the brightest and most gifted intellects of that period reasoned on the shape and size of the earth, the position and extent of Asia, and how the vast empire of the Grand Khan, whose capital was at Cathay, with its countless millions of subjects, its numerous provinces and tributary kingdoms, its unnumbered cities, could be reached by water. "Do not wonder," writes Dr. Toscanelli, in his letter to Martinez, Canon of Lisbon, a copy of which the former sent to Columbus, "at my calling the regions where the spices are found, west, whilst they are commonly called east; for any one sailing to the west will reach them by a *subterranean* course; but travelling by land and over the earth they are found to the east." And in his letter to Columbus Dr. Toscanelli writes, "I appreciate your grand and noble desire to sail from the east to the west, according to the chart that I sent you, and, as will be better shown by a round sphere. I am glad you understood it, and that the voyage is not only possible, but certain; the honor and profit will be beyond calculation, and the reputation great among all Christians. You can only learn this perfectly from experience and practice, and I have had the surest and fullest information from illustrious and learned men, who came from those parts to the Court of Rome here, and from other merchants—persons of good authority—who traded for a long time in those lands. When that

voyage is made, it will be to powerful kingdoms and noble cities, and provinces abounding with everything we need; with every kind of spices and great plenty of jewels. It will also be to kings and princes most desirous of intercourse with Christians of our land, as well because many of them are Christians, as because they are anxious to meet and converse with the men of our country, who are wise and learned not only in religion, but in all the other sciences, on account of the great reputation of our governments. For which reason, and for many others that I might name, I am not surprised at the courage of your heart, or that the whole Portuguese nation, always distinguished in every enterprise, should be full of enthusiasm for the voyage." It is evident that Toscanelli's impressions of Asia, and his errors also, are based, like those of Columbus, on the writings of Marco Polo, who visited the Eastern countries in 1271 and remained there for eighteen years. The Christians in the East, of whom he writes, must have been the mythical subjects of the mythical Christian Emperor of the East, Prester John, and it is evident that while the king of Portugal was following quite a different route, it was natural that he should ask the Canon of Lisbon to write to the Doctor for an explanation. It is strange that Toscanelli should have considered the western voyage a *subterranean* one, which is an error into which Columbus never fell. It would also seem clear from the fact that Toscanelli states that all Portugal was enthusiastic for the voyage westward, which Columbus proposed, that the latter must have already publicly presented it. While Columbus sent to Toscanelli a globe, Toscanelli sent to Columbus a chart. Toscanelli gives a preference to the globe of Columbus. Columbus eighteen years later, in his first voyage, in which he discovered the New World, carried with him the chart, which Toscanelli had sent him. While it is apparent that Toscanelli confirmed Columbus in his errors, as to countries he would find, and as to the extent of Asia and of the ocean, it is equally certain that he strengthened the convictions of Columbus as to the practicability of his undertaking, expressed his learned and weighty concurrence in his ideas, and fired his heart for the grand expedition. The Admiral's son and historian, Fernando Columbus, has well said, "it made the Admiral still hotter for his discovery." To the learned Florentine is due the credit and honor of giving new impulse to the splendid schemes of Columbus, which were destined to bring to light nations never dreamed of by Marco Polo or Toscanelli, and to change so vastly the geography of the earth. Strange it is to observe the contrast between the opulent countries and empires, and powerful sovereigns, described by Dr. Toscanelli, and the simple Indian caciques and their naked sub-

jects, uncultivated islands and primitive governments, which Columbus actually discovered. While Toscanelli learnedly dreamed, Columbus shaped the spherical earth, brought the antipodes to visit Europe, solved the mysteries which had puzzled Aristotle, and planted the Cross in the New World of his discovery.

Columbus did not make an offer of his discovery immediately, for it was not an undertaking that could be assumed by any individual; only a government could do so. It is not known why he waited so much longer; probably his views and proposals were too far in advance of the knowledge and convictions of the age, or even of the Portuguese government, even though Dr. Toscanelli had stated that Portugal was fired with enthusiasm to undertake the voyage. It is even doubtful to what government he first made his offer. An old and not improbable tradition relates that he first proposed the enterprise to his native country, Genoa, from motives of patriotism and generosity. But Genoa was no longer the magnificent Genoa of old; her power and glory had departed; she refused, from necessity, the noble proposals of her illustrious son. Venice is also mentioned as the second government to which he presented his plans and by which they were rejected; but this statement is not regarded as sufficiently authenticated. Portugal had become his adopted country, and gladly would he have broached the subject to Affonso V., king of that nation; but this monarch was engaged in an expensive and fruitless war in the interests of Princess Juana, then contesting the crown of Castile with Isabella, and Portugal had been also impoverished already by her efforts to discover a route to India by following the coasts of Africa. As the conditions were not favorable in Portugal under Affonso V., Columbus waited until 1481, when John II. had succeeded his father on the throne. In this reign the spirit and enterprise of Prince Henry the Navigator were revived, and the maritime spirit of the Portuguese was rekindled. The king had appointed three learned astronomers and cosmographers to devise a means of freeing ships from the restricted limits of navigation near the coasts and of enabling them to sail and return in unknown seas and under all parts of the heavens, and the result of this auspicious movement was the application of the astrolabe, heretofore used only in astronomy, also to navigation. This was an important invention for the world and especially for Columbus, for now the compass and the astrolabe would enable him to brave the dread Atlantic, the Sea of Darkness, and to guide his ships back to Europe in case either of failure or success.

This enterprise, which he recognized as a heavenly inspiration, pressed urgently upon his mind, and he felt prepared to execute it. He had followed the sea from the age of fourteen, had visited every

known land, had gone even as far as Iceland, the Ultima Thule, in 1447, had studied every science bearing on navigation, and by his visit to the Portuguese fort, St. George at the Mine, under the equinoctial, he had dispelled the popular delusion that the equatorial belt was uninhabitable, by his own personal experience and testimony. Scarcely a living man, if any one, had followed the sea as many years, or traversed as much of the earth, as he. The son of destiny and prophecy was now prepared for the accomplishment.

Columbus, deeming the occasion propitious, made his proposals for the discovery of the western lands over across the Atlantic to the king of Portugal. The conduct of the king was so equivocal as to leave us at a loss to ascertain his motives. Whether he was captivated by the brilliant prospects laid before him, or convinced by the cogent arguments of Columbus, or was merely temporizing, or was desirous to throw off the importunities of one whom he considered visionary, or was at heart anxious to undertake the enterprise, provided he could induce his counsellors to so advise him, and thus share the responsibility, seems involved in doubt and obscurity. Twice he referred the matter to a council of learned men, at court, and twice they reported against it. On the last occasion, Cazadilla, Bishop of Ceuta, was the leading opponent of the proposals, and he, in turn, seeing disappointment and displeasure depicted on the king's countenance, endeavored to recover royal favor by making a suggestion, as unfortunate to his own fame that he should have proposed it, as it was dishonorable to the king, that he should have adopted it.

Some have supposed that Columbus and the king differed only on the terms, the latter being unwilling to grant the lofty and princely concessions which the former demanded from the beginning. However this may be, the king, with Cazadilla and other courtiers, basely asked Columbus for his charts and drawings, in order, as pretended, to consider the subject; and while the latter was only too well pleased to send them to the king in hopes of a better result, the royal trickster and his advisers fraudulently fitted out a caravel with perfect secrecy, under the pretence of sending supplies to the Cape Verde Islands, but they really intended, by following the directions laid down in the charts of Columbus, to make the effort to discover the new lands, and thus rob him of all the glory of the discovery. It is difficult to reconcile such perfidy, dishonesty and baseness with the positions and pretensions of those engaged in it. But the fact is unquestioned. The voyage ended in failure as complete as were the dishonor and the perfidy of its perpetrators. The first storm on the Atlantic brought their vain wanderings to an end; they returned chagrined to the Cape

Verde Islands; and they treacherously endeavored to cover their own shame by ridiculing the plans of Columbus as a dream, a fiction, or the fancy of a disordered mind.

Columbus discovered beyond a question this unworthy attempt to wrong him, and he availed himself of the first opportunity of secretly departing forever from Portugal, shaking the dust of that country from his feet. He carried with him his little son Diego. It is supposed that he visited Genoa and gave assistance and comfort to his aged father, his mother being then dead. It is also conjectured by some that he now again, in person, made his proposals to his native city, but with the same result as before. His long delay and struggles with Portugal, and his travels, left him extremely impoverished. In his desperate poverty it is a grand spectacle to see him assisting to his utmost his venerable parent. He was thus actually begging his way from court to court while he held the secret of unknown worlds and of boundless wealth. A year of uncertain events and struggles intervenes in this epoch of his life. He left Portugal towards the end of 1484, and must have arrived in Spain towards the end of the year 1485.

In poverty and distress, weary and travel-worn, the next scene in the remarkable and providential life of this extraordinary man was near the maritime town of Palos, in Andalusia, Spain, where, at the gates of the Franciscan Convent of La Rabida, he and his little son asked for bread and water from the porter of the convent. Father and son were on their way to Huelva to visit his brother-in-law, Muhar, who had married a sister of Doña Felipa Moñi, his wife, with whom he could leave Diego, while he continued his anticipated applications from court to court.

Historians have recognized the hand of Providence in his rejection by Portugal, Genoa and Venice, and in the very poverty which brought him a beggar to the convent gate. It was here he found a friend in cowl and cassock, with more intellect and heart than kings and princes had shown, with more generosity and nobility than the great ones of the earth had possessed. The designs of God in his behalf now began to unfold themselves. An humble monk was the noble instrument of heaven. For at this moment passing by, as the stranger and his boy were refreshing themselves with bread and water, Father Juan Perez de Marchena, the guardian of the convent, was struck with the lofty mien, the intellectual brow, the manly carriage and impressive demeanor of the man, and still more with his profound and learned conversation. The beggar imparted to the friar the secret of a new world. Claimed as a guest, the stranger was heard to detail his plans to the charmed and intelligent community. Garcia of Palos, who

was then consulted, sustained the theories of the stranger, and old pilots recalled and related again the traditions of the sea, as often told and retold by many a veteran tar. The friar caught from the missionary zeal of Columbus the apostolic fire; as a Spaniard the future glory of his country dawned upon him, and as a Churchman rich harvests of souls were foretold for the Church. Young Diego was detained at the convent and Columbus was supplied with money for his journey and a letter of introduction to the prior of the monastery of El Prado, the Queen's confessor. Taking leave of his new, but trustful friends, he now wended his way to Cordova, where the royal court was then held. It was in January, 1486. Ferdinand and Isabella, both young, gifted, aspiring, zealous for the faith, ambitious of renown and capable of governing empires, then reigned over the united kingdoms of Aragon and Castile. Ferdinand had not lived and reigned long enough to be openly crafty, selfish and ungrateful. Isabella was incapable of ever being so. While Father Juan Perez was the providential friend, Isabella was the providential queen. The destiny of Columbus seemed near to fulfilment. It was fortunate that Isabella possessed those high qualities of mind and heart, which Tarducci describes as pre-eminently fitting her to reign and to lead among sovereigns. It was fortunate, as Mr. Irving writes, that she was one of the purest and most beautiful characters in history. It was fortunate, as Montalembert relates, that she was the noblest woman that ever reigned over men. It was providential, as the Count de Lorgues so eloquently pleads, that a tender piety, a profound sense of religion, an unswerving faith, a broad capacity, a love of souls, and a true Christian zeal, made her worthy to be the patroness of the apostolic mission of Columbus.

Isabella had inherited the gloriously commenced but yet unfinished work of expelling the infidel Moors from Christian Spain. The crusade was then at its height, and when Columbus arrived at Cordova, the king and queen, the nobility and generals of Spain, at the head of the Christian armies, were marshalling for a final blow at Mahometanism in the Peninsula. The clang of arms, the din of preparation, the ardor of war overcame the voice of petition for the discovery even of a new world. Columbus was a silent and submissive but intensely disappointed spectator of these bustling and warlike scenes. He earnestly and hopefully sought the presence of the prior of the monastery of Prado, Fernando de Talavera, but the cautious and busy ecclesiastic put him off; the king and queen were too much engrossed by the war, and neither the queen nor her confessor had time to listen to the new and startling scheme, if not mad dream, of a poor and threadbare foreigner. His arrival in Cordova was on January 20, 1486. Campaigns, sieges, battles

and marches caused the court to shift its location according to military emergency. Columbus again resorted, for his support, to map making at Cordova. Such was his poverty that, but for the food generously given him by Alonzo de Quintanilla, he would have perished of hunger. In the midst of his sufferings he bore himself with dignity and courage, and no doubt even when his talent for cosmographical maps became known he won but a scanty support. It is certain that during this period of disappointment and of waiting he numbered amongst his friends not only the generous Quintanilla, treasurer of Castile, but also Monsignor Antonio Geraldini, the Papal Nuncio, and his brother, Alessandro, preceptor to the royal Infanta. Through these sympathetic and intelligent friends he was introduced to the powerful Cardinal of Spain, Pedro Gonzalez de Mendoza, Archbishop of Toledo, whose learning, penetration and judgment enabled him to appreciate the force of Columbus' arguments, and the value of his undertaking both to the Church and to Spain.

It was also during this period of waiting that he became acquainted with the noble and ancient family of Enriquez, one of the proudest, though not the richest, in Spain. This acquaintance led to his marriage into that distinguished family. Beatrix Enriquez became his second wife, and their union was blessed by the birth of Fernando Columbus. He afterwards became his father's historian, and under the will of Columbus, upon the failure of the lineage of Diego, the first son, was to succeed to the titles, honors, dignities and estates which the admiral was by the royal covenants to receive in recompense for his great discoveries. More than a century after the death of Columbus an inconsiderate critic hastily and rashly threw out a doubt as to the legality of this second marriage, which had never before been called in question, but had been uniformly affirmed by all contemporary and succeeding authorities, as well as by those more than a hundred years subsequent to the death of Columbus. This unjust aspersion against the good name and unblemished memory of one of the purest and most upright of men has inconsiderately been followed by many historians of repute, including our own gifted historian and scholar, Washington Irving. But it has been repeatedly refuted, and in recent years triumphantly disproved by the able and learned works of the Count Roselly de Lorgues, as well as by the more recent work of the Jesuit Father, Arthur George Knight, of England. A document of special value bearing on this subject, and one not found or published by Count de Lorgues, which has recently been found in the library of the Royal Historical Academy of Madrid by the Rev. Brother Marcellino da Civezza, historiographer of the Order of St. Francis, and another also recently

found at Valencia by the Rev. Raymond Buldee, are sufficient to refute this calumny. These valuable documents were not very far from being contemporary with Columbus. From the former of these documents, extracted from a work specially devoted to the history of the noble families of Cordova, we have taken a passage which we translate and publish now for the first time in English, as follows :

“ Christopher Columbus, grand admiral of the West Indies, married twice—the first time in Portugal with Dona Philippina Muñiz de Perestrello, who gave him his oldest son, Diego ; the second time in Cordova, with a young lady of that city named Beatrix Enriquez de Arana, of high lineage, a descendant of the Viscaya ; and from her he had Don Fernando Columbus, a knight of great intelligence, bravery, virtue and a great scholar, after leaving the service of the Prince Don Juan, whose page he had been.”

Through the offices and potent influence of Mendoza, the Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo, a man of learning, generosity, enlightened energy and breadth of views, Columbus received an audience with the Spanish sovereigns, Ferdinand and Isabella ; a boon which had been long delayed by the exigencies of the Moorish war. Though regarded by the vulgar and the ignorant as a conceited dreamer and fantastic projector, his impressive appearance, his dignified manners, his clear and ringing language, the sincerity of his character and his ready learning had already gained for him the respect and sympathy of the great, the good and the learned. Now he gained the ear of royalty. This audience occurred in 1486. On appearing before the august court of the Catholic sovereigns he was modest in deportment, profoundly respectful and yet open, candid and self-sustained. He felt this first time that he met them the same prophetic foresight as he did afterwards, in 1503, when he addressed them from the New World as the “ ambassador of the Most High, chosen by His infinite Goodness to announce the enterprise of the Indies, to the most potent prince of Christendom laboring unceasingly for the propagation of the faith.” In the royal presence he calmly, lucidly and triumphantly explained the scientific, traditional and practical grounds on which his theory rested, described the empires he should discover for Spain, and the millions of souls that would be gained for Christendom, and extolled it above the noble yet comparatively contracted and diminutive enterprise and benefits of the Moorish conquests. He asked for ships and outfit, and he would unfalteringly achieve a certain and glorious result. The Catholic sovereigns were deeply impressed by the bold yet dazzling proposals and profound arguments of Columbus. The noble and generous nature of Isabella seemed at once to comprehend and

appreciate the grandeur of the enterprise, its glory and benefits to Spain, its exalted good to the poor heathens, and its boundless advantages to religion. The more calculating Ferdinand, while deeply moved by Columbus' proposals, arguments and proofs, cautiously refrained from committing himself, and resolved to refer the whole matter to a learned body for investigation. Father Talavera was accordingly requested to assemble a learned board of theologians, cosmographers and astronomers to examine, discuss and report on the subject. Such was the origin, such was the object of the famous council of Salamanca. Columbus anticipated the happiest results from the convening of so learned and august a body. Talavera, owing to the backwardness of Spain in geographical and cosmographical guides and enterprises, found but few members for the council who were skilled in such matters, hence the majority of the council or junta were necessarily chosen from the clergy and one or two other professions. The great majority were ecclesiastics. The conference was held in the Dominican Monastery of St. Stephen's, where Columbus became the welcome and honored guest of the generous and enlightened friars. It was a remarkable spectacle, when a mere foreign mariner, untitled and undecked, relying solely on the justice of his cause, stood in the midst of this dignified and punctilious body. Without prestige, with none of the trappings of wealth and station, without indorsement or diploma from any learned university, he had no dependence but upon his own genius and courage, and these did not fail him. With the exception of the Dominican Fathers, who listened attentively to all he had to say, and received intelligent conviction therefrom, the members of the junta seemed from the beginning to be prejudiced against his cause and against his person, regarding him as an adventurer and a visionary. The majority paid but little attention to his discourse, ignorantly and arrogantly feeling content to accept the status of the earth as it had been traditionally and unscientifically handed down to them. The case seemed already prejudged. When some discussion naturally sprang up, the arguments adduced against Columbus seem puerile and ridiculous. The distinguished and learned members of the council denied the sphericity of the earth, and quoted the words of David to prove that the earth and the impending heavens must be flat; the scriptural expression, *extendens coelum sicut pellem*, was inconsiderately construed as representing the heavens as drawn tight and flat across and over the earth like the extended hide of an animal, as was the custom of the pastoral Israelites in the time of David and his predecessors, in forming their tents; or like a horizontal curtain or cover. Every passage from the Old Testament and from the Fathers of the Church bear-

ing however remotely on the subject, was hunted up and adduced in opposition to the theory of Columbus.

That passage of St. Augustine, in which the illustrious doctor regarded the idea of the antipodes as a ridiculous and amusing fable, was confidently quoted in refutation of his scientific arguments. Various and endless were the objections crudely stated and illogically argued. Columbus, however, was so thoroughly master of the whole subject, that he found no difficulty in refuting and exposing the sophistry of his opponents, whether drawn from Scripture or from the Fathers or from science. When he boldly met and explained the religious and theological points, upon principles and methods of correct interpretation, and as now accepted by Christian scholars, with unanswerable arguments, a murmur passed through the assembly that his views were heretical, and that he might be subjected to the scrutiny of the Inquisition. His friend, Alessandro Geraldini, a learned scholar and profound theologian, taking warning at once, hastened to the great cardinal of Spain, and by his influence, and still more by his arguments, warded off the danger. Columbus, in the Council of Salamanca, rose to the grandeur of his mission. Power of argument, unanswerable facts, invincible logic, and sublime eloquence, almost transfigured him. The conviction of the noble Diego Deza, afterwards archbishop of Toledo, of the Dominican Fathers, and of a few other learned theologians, gained a more calm audience for the pleader for a new world, and perhaps led to the adjournment of the assembly from time to time, rather than to the abrupt rejection of the proposal. Procrastination, indifference, neglect, and prejudice, made the work of the conference fruitless. Columbus followed up the subject with the Spanish Court. In the spring of 1487, he again sought to promote his cause, at Malaga, during its siege by the Catholic sovereigns; again at Cordova, then at Saragossa; and thus, as late as February, 1489, he again followed the court to Valladolid, then to Medina del Campo, and again to Cordova. Occasional payments were made by the Crown to Columbus during these anxious and wasting years, ostensibly for services; and at Cordova, lodgings were provided for him at the royal expense. The fortunes of the war varied; the campaign against the strong city of Beza, in which Columbus patriotically served as a soldier in the Spanish army, finally proved triumphant, and on December, 22, 1490, Muley Boabdil, the elder Moorish chief of that name, surrendered to the victorious sovereigns, Ferdinand and Isabella. The conquerors entered Seville in triumph in February, 1491; regal and national festivities and rejoicings engrossed every mind; a royal marriage ensued; *and Columbus waited.* He received occasional subsidies

from the Crown, which indicated that he had gained some little ground, or that his cause was not rejected at Court; but he still made maps and charts for a living. He even received the tantalizing encouragement of an order or summons to follow the Court,—that which he had, in fact, been doing for several years. Time passed on; and such was the pinching poverty of Columbus, that he was compelled to live on the alms he received from his generous friends, Deza, Quintanilla, and a few others. In the winter of 1491, he saw the whole of Spain exerting its utmost strength and power towards commencing the siege of Grenada. Surely, when this city should be conquered by Spanish valor, a New World might be worth discovering; the Mohammedans would have perished by the sword—surely, then, the countless heathens of another hemisphere might now be saved by the Cross! But the natural sentiment of self-preservation aroused the followers of the Prophet. The Mohammedans of Spain felt that the death-struggle was upon them, and they appealed for aid in their dire extremity to their co-religionists in Northern Africa; their prayer of anguish was heard; and it seemed that Spain might experience another, yet a forlorn and desperate, invasion of the Crescent and its fanatical followers. The Crescent and the Cross had yet to meet again in battle. The younger Boabdil, el Chico, was at the head of his legions, intrenched in the impregnable fortress of Grenada. It was not consistent now with the national honor of Spain to leave a vestige of Mohammedan possession or rule in the Peninsula. The Cross alone should glitter there. Both banners could not float in Spain.

Columbus, after years of solicitation and waiting, had abandoned perfidious Portugal, and brushed its dust from his feet; he now resolved to leave Spain, and try his fortunes and plead the cause of the New World in France, to whose sovereign he had but recently sent his proposals. He had previously sent his ever-faithful brother Bartholomew to England, to present the same to then Catholic Britain, and to her king, Henry VII. He abandoned a court from which he had received only hope deferred and agonizing delay. He accordingly made his way to the convent of La Rabida, intending to remove his son, Diego, thence, and place him, with the young Fernando, in charge of his second wife, Beatrice Enriquez, at Cordova, before proceeding to the Court of France. This was the second visit Columbus had paid to the Convent of La Rabida. Since his first visit in 1486, when he asked bread and water at the convent gate for himself and son, he had spent five years at court in fruitless and humiliating solicitations. At his second visit to the convent, in 1491, he was as poor as he had been at his first visit, and yet much more dejected and hopeless. The best

part of his life had been spent in solicitation; and yet it seemed that he had accomplished nothing. Life and hope had waned together. At each visit to La Rabida, he was welcomed by prior and monks with equal hospitality.

Columbus had received already a letter from the king of Portugal, John II., dated March 20, 1488, inviting him back to Portugal, and giving him assurances of the royal protection; but he had distrustingly rejected the invitation. He had also received letters from the kings of England and of France; he had given Spain the preference over all. Even when Spain seemed to have rejected his proposals, he made application for aid in fitting out an expedition to two Spanish grandees; first to the Duke of Medina-Sidonia, and secondly, to the Duke of Medina-Celi; but here, too, though he had deeply impressed those noblemen with his great plans and proposals, and though, had they been sovereigns, they would have accepted his offers; yet the scheme was too vast for the most powerful of subjects or richest of nobles; he was doomed to meet with new disappointments. Penniless, he was unable to provide subsistence for himself, and still less for his wife and two sons; no wonder that the learned and sympathetic historian, Tarducci, said, "the father's heart was ready to burst."

The noble soul of Columbus found sympathy again at La Rabida in the great heart of the prior, Juan Perez de Marchena. The monk's judgment was fortified by the opinions of experienced cosmographers and mariners of Palos; another effort must be made in Spain. A letter was promptly dispatched by the prior to Queen Isabella by the hands of Sebastian Rodriguez, a faithful pilot of Lepi, while Columbus remained an honored guest at the convent. The messenger, within two weeks, delivered Father Marchena's letter to the Queen at the city of Santa Fé, and brought back the royal answer to La Rabida. The good prior immediately, at the request of the Queen, repaired to the court at Santa Fé, starting at midnight, and making the journey through the enemy's country, secretly, without even a lantern, and in danger of capture by the Moors at each step of his mule in the dark. When he appeared before Isabella, he seemed already like the apostle of a new Christendom, such was the eloquence of his noble countenance. With arguments and motives drawn from science, religion, and patriotism, the prior pleaded with the gentle queen. His appeals were generously and ardently supported by the noble and exalted inspiration of one of her own sex, her favorite maid of honor, the Marchioness of Moya, a woman true to every sentiment of religion and honorable ambition for her country. The point is gained; Isabella sends for Columbus to come before her again, and dispatches the money necessary to enable him to make

a respectable appearance at court, and to procure a mule for his journey.

So prompt and earnest was Columbus to reach the presence of the queen, and plead again the cause of the New World, it is said, that he scarcely gave himself time to purchase the requisite clothing for appearing at court. Surely, now his cause was gained ! Portugal, England, France, and even Spain, seemed to supplicate the suppliant of twenty years ! Who could suppose that Columbus would meet with a moment's delay again, or that the Court would not be thrown open to the greatest of geographical projectors ?

At the time of his arrival at the city of Santa Fé, the war against Granada was in its last crisis. This proud Moorish city, the last stronghold of the Infidels in Spain, had sustained a brave and obstinate siege, and had made a gallant defence, but was now brought to the verge of surrender ; her walls were battered down, her defences destroyed, her weapons exhausted ; she lay at the mercy of the Christian army, and her defenders were demoralized by civil discord, and fraternal blood shed within the ranks of her own garrison. The youngest and bravest of her royal line, Boabdil el Chico, was forced to open the gates of the proud city to the foes of nearly eight hundred years, and the Spanish sovereigns, in the near-by city of Santa Fé, were preparing to enter the fallen stronghold and supplant the last Crescent in Spain with the Cross. Such was the condition of affairs when Columbus entered the royal city, silently yet hopefully, mounted on his mule. But again he was put off ; the sovereigns sent him word that at such a moment in their affairs they could not receive him or attend to his proposals. The Queen, however, considerably consigned him to the hospitality of his good friend Alonzo de Quintanilla, for she knew their mutual friendship, and the disappointed suppliant found consolation in the friendship of the Queen's Minister of Finance. On January 20, 1492, Boabdil, last of the Moorish kings, surrendered the keys of the city of Granada to Father Talavera, who was created Archbishop of Granada, and who drew down the banner of the Crescent and raised the Cross on the towers of the Alhambra. Ferdinand and Isabella solemnly and triumphantly entered the conquered city on the feast of the Epiphany, January 6th, and the rejoicings and celebrations that followed were in keeping with the grandeur of the occasion and the importance of the event. Under such circumstances, Columbus, though his mind dwelt sadly and solemnly on his one great thought, could but wait. This time he did not wait in vain.

It is but just, however, to the Spanish sovereigns to relate that the first business to which they gave their attention after the national festivities following the fall of Granada, was the affair

of Columbus. The royal mind was made up that his proposal should be accepted. Columbus had seemed already elevated above the ordinary standard of men; he had conceived a truth unknown to the world; he had prayed for an opportunity to put his life in peril to demonstrate it; now it was that kings sought his alliance, that thereby they might reap the reward of his study, his genius and his heroism. Ferdinand and Isabella having determined to embark in the great enterprise of Columbus realized that it only now remained to arrange with him the terms of the venture, for so it appeared to them and to the world. Accordingly a commission was appointed of which Talavera was also the president, to stipulate with Columbus on the terms upon which he would undertake the momentous voyage of discovery. Columbus, on the other hand, did not regard the affair as a venture, but as a certainty; he saw from the beginning the vastness, the grandeur, the priceless value of the prize awaiting his valor and his genius; he had in his mind even at this early period of civilization not only the bestowal upon Spain of a new world and upon Christendom of a new apostolate and a new triumph, but he also regarded himself as the instrument especially selected by Providence for restoring to Christendom the Holy Land and sacred places consecrated by the life, the death and blood of the Saviour of mankind. This last great work had already developed in his mind and soul though he had not announced it to the world. In fact, as it was afterwards made manifest, he regarded the discovery of the New World as secondary to the far greater undertaking of rescuing the Holy Land from the hands of the infidels and restoring it to Christendom. In his great soul the treasures of the New Christendom were to be consecrated to a vindication of the honor and integrity of the old. He had resolved to devote a large share of his expected revenues to this sacred cause for which two centuries before Christian kings and people had sacrificed so much valuable treasure and so much gallant blood. He regarded himself as entitled to a reward commensurate with his certain success and with the immensity of the prize he was to bestow upon his country; a reward adequate to the undertaking of the Columbian crusade. All this, when paid to him, would leave Spain and the world still his debtor. This proves there was nothing mercenary about Columbus.

When, therefore, the royal commissioners opened negotiations with him in regard to the terms of the undertaking, Columbus demanded the rank and title of Admiral of the Ocean, together with all the powers and privileges belonging to the admirals of Castile in their respective districts, the rank, title and jurisdictions of viceroy and governor of all the islands and continents he should

discover, with the same authority enjoyed by the admirals of Castile and Leon, including the power to make and revoke at his discretion all the executive and judiciary appointments; that all provincial and municipal governors should be selected by the sovereigns from the three persons he should nominate for each place, and that he himself should appoint the judges to decide upon all controverted questions of commerce and affairs arising between the Indies and any part of Spain. He also demanded, in addition to the compensation belonging to the aforesaid offices of admiral, viceroy and governor, one-tenth as his share of all things to be found, bought, won or exchanged within the boundaries of his admiralty, subject only to one-tenth of the cost of acquisition. As he had already devoted the best part of his life to the cause, and as the remainder of his life would not suffice for the full accomplishment of all things, and as the sovereigns and the world would transmit the fruits of his discoveries to posterity, so he also demanded that the same offices, titles and emoluments should become hereditary in his family in the order of primogeniture. Would not the design of redeeming the Holy Land fall to his descendants to finish, according to the intended provisions of his will? Then why should the means of fulfilling the great task be withdrawn at his death. Furthermore who would inherit his name and his apostolate? Should the family of the Ocean admiral and viceroy and governor of the Indies be left in poverty, while Spain and the world grew rich, and while the crusade was conducted at the expense of Columbus and his heirs?

The terms demanded by Columbus aroused the indignation; even the contempt, of the commission. One of them sneeringly said to him, that as the sovereigns were to pay the whole expense of the expedition, his demands manifested great regard for his own interests, since, whatever might be the result, he could enjoy the honor of a great command and incur no loss in case of failure. Columbus immediately repelled the malicious innuendo by offering to bear one-eighth of the expense on condition of his receiving one-eighth of the profits. Talavera, in behalf of the commission, reported against the proposals of Columbus, and gave his version of the grounds of their rejection. Isabella's mind was perplexed between the arguments of her former confessor, the Prior of La Rabida, and those of her present confessor, Archbishop Talavera. She proposed other terms to Columbus, which though honorable, still in his judgment were inadequate; these in turn were rejected by him. The negotiations were broken off, and Columbus, early in February, 1492, departed again from the court and from the royal city, and was on his way to Cordova to take leave of his wife and children, and then to proceed to France.

The friends of Columbus were greatly grieved at this abrupt and unfortunate termination of the negotiations. Many of them made powerful appeals to the queen, for all seemed to trust in her greatness of mind and soul for the ultimate success of the undertaking. Principal among these advocates of Columbus and his cause was Luis de Santangel, receiver of the ecclesiastical revenues of Aragon; his noble appeal to Isabella should be preserved in perpetual memory, and we give it to our readers; he said, "He was greatly astonished that her highness, who had always shown the greatness of her mind in every important affair, should now fail to undertake one where the risk was so small, and the service of God, the exaltation of the Church, and the gain of glory to the kingdom and people of Spain were so great. And here was Christopher Columbus going to offer his undertaking elsewhere, and other princes would enjoy the glory and advantages which the sovereigns of Spain rejected. What a sorrow would it not be to her, what a mortification, to have refused the demands of Christopher Columbus, when she should hear his name resounding through all Europe for his wonderful discovery! How justly would her people complain that she had deprived them of such glory and benefits, and left other nations to enjoy this good fortune! They laid the blame of the disagreement on the pride and immoderate greed of Columbus; but what had he asked for that should excite such wonder and complaint of the boldness and impudence of his demands? He asked to be paid for his labor, if he succeeded in fulfilling what he had promised; and he promised to bestow on Spain islands, kingdoms, seas, treasures, and nations without number; if his undertaking came to nothing, he asked nothing; and he not only risked his life in the dangers of the voyage, but he also offered to share the expense of carrying it out. And this was called unbounded pretension! This was impudence! This was regarding only his own pride and ambition! Some of these learned men said that the enterprise was impossible, but the convincing arguments brought forward by Columbus proved quite the reverse; and this was proved, too, by his readiness to undertake the voyage, and his liberality in bearing part of the cost; and a man of so much study and experience of the sea was not influenced by appearances and the seductions of imaginary suppositions, but had his thoughts firmly grounded in scientific reasons. Even admitting that the voyage resulted in nothing, that could be no shame to the crown, as some pretended; but rather the direct contrary; for, if other princes had been highly lauded for merely attempting a step or two in the road of discovery, what glory would not their highnesses gain if they boldly pursued the discovery of one of the greatest secrets of the universe? Nor should it be said that it was

too uncertain, for in matters of great importance, even a doubt ought to be cleared up ; and to ascertain the truth of such doubt, any sum was well spent. And the sum asked by Columbus to procure and fit out a few ships was so trifling, that any wealthy individual could bear it without inconvenience. Let her highness, then, silence every other consideration, and listen only to her magnanimity, and not suffer posterity to think that the glorious Isabella, on the point of undertaking the greatest work ever imagined on earth, was withheld by the fear of risking the loss of a small sum of money."

The noble and generous Isabella was a willing convert to the exalted views of the treasurer of Aragon. His victory was complete ; for she now pledged her word that she would undertake and carry out the expedition, and that she would accept the terms so strenuously insisted on by Columbus. But even now there was another obstacle, another cause of delay. So great was the financial exhaustion caused by the recent wars that she felt compelled to defer the expedition until the means were provided, when she would at once proceed. Ferdinand was not pleased with the queen's compliance, and, again alleging an exhausted exchequer, he struggled to win her away from the undertaking. It was at this moment that Isabella proved herself a true Castilian. She replied to the king :

" Very well ; I will assume the whole burden of the cost, as Queen of Castile ; and if it is believed that further delay may jeopardize the undertaking, I will pledge my jewels to raise the necessary funds."

Santangel promptly replied : " It is not necessary for your Highness to pledge your diamonds ; I will take it on myself to find the sum necessary for proceeding at once with the undertaking."

Isabella and Santangel were the heroes of the occasion. The offer of Santangel was accepted by the queen. A captain of the guards was dispatched for Columbus to summon him to court. The officer overtook the greatest hero of the occasion, as, in solemn silence and sadness, he traversed the road near the bridge of Peños. The summons moved not at first the man of so many disappointments ; words of renewed assurance were uttered by the captain in the queen's name ; a moment of hesitation followed ; Columbus saw in faith and science the New World ; he turned his mule's head back to Santa Fè, and uttered a prayer of thanksgiving, *Deo Gracias*. At court once more the offer is renewed, the acceptance is given. The queen yielded all, while Ferdinand, urged by the queen and his courtiers, yielded a formal consent, which was limited to signing the compact as was required

by the terms of union between Castile and Aragon. Beyond that he declined co-operation. When funds were to be drawn from the coffers of Aragon, there existed a regular contract for their reimbursement.

The undertaking was Isabella's; so much so that during the separate administrations of Castile and Aragon none but Castilians were allowed to reside and trade in the New World. Accordingly Ferdinand, when he received the first gold paid to him from the New World for reimbursement of his outlay, applied it to the gilding of the ceilings and vaults of his own royal palace at Saragossa. Christopher Columbus, on the other hand, thus verifying his prophetic name of the Christ-bearer, consecrated the first gold he received from the New World to the making of a chalice of the purest virgin gold for holding the Holy Eucharist, the Christ in the Sacrament of Love and Thanksgiving.

The true position of Columbus was now royally acknowledged by Ferdinand and Isabella; he was publicly treated with the deference and respect due to his exalted office; the noble title of Don was affixed to his name, and was conferred upon him and his descendants and heirs. On April 17, 1492, the Articles of Agreement between the sovereigns and Columbus, which had now been drawn up, with every point of ceremony observed, were signed in solemn form by Ferdinand and Isabella, and by Columbus. His full demands were conceded, and the additional clause was added by which Columbus reserved the right to contribute one-eighth towards the expenses of this or of any other expedition he might undertake for their majesties, in consideration whereof he was to receive one-eighth of the profits. On April 30th, letters patent, in solemn form, were issued and published, conferring upon Columbus, and confirming, all his titles and privileges as stipulated by the treaty, and declaring the offices of Governor and Viceroy to be hereditary in his family. Columbus was now virtually admitted among the Spanish nobility, and from this time he had to maintain a certain dignity consistent with his rank in that punctilious age and country.

Tradition and romance added an interesting feature to this solemn compact and formal arrangement for exploring the earth and bringing together the most distant potentates, empires and people. Belief in the existence of monarchs of potent and fabulous grandeur and riches was then quite general; and that the prospective voyage of Columbus would carry him to the extremities of Asia and to the fabled regions of spices and gold, no one doubted. Odd as it seems to us in our age to behold the foremost and most accomplished monarchs of Europe addressing a letter to the Grand Khan, to Prester John and other Oriental potentates, the

fact itself is so interesting that we will transcribe it here for the amusement of the reader.

“Ferdinand and Isabella, to the King——

“The Spanish Sovereigns have heard that You and Your Subjects have a great affection for them and for Spain. They are further aware that you and your subjects are very desirous of information concerning Spain; they accordingly send their Admiral, Christopher Columbus, who will tell you that they are in good health and perfect prosperity.”

“Granada, April 30, 1520.”

Not only was Columbus now received and treated by the Spanish sovereigns with the dignity and consideration extended only to noblemen, but the queen, with true royal tenderness and delicacy, conferred upon him an unexpected favor in appointing his elder son, Diego, a page of honor to the royal prince, the Infante Don Juan, heir-apparent to the Spanish throne, with a liberal annuity. The Spanish form of his name, Colon, now became of general use in Spain, and was inserted in all the official documents. Preparations were immediately commenced for the expedition, which was destined to prove so honorable to Spain, so momentous to the world, so manfully demanded and so successfully executed by Columbus. The little maritime town of Palos had already become signally associated with the history of the Admiral; it was now chosen as the port that was to supply him with the ships for the discovery of the New World, and from which that little fleet was to sail. Palos was already under a penalty, for some disturbance within its limits, to supply and keep in readiness for sea in the royal service two caravels, but as Columbus had declared that three vessels at least were necessary for the expedition, he was empowered to procure another. The authorities of Andalusia were directed by royal decree to provide all necessary supplies for the ships and severe penalties were denounced against any persons refusing to do so. The supplies were declared free from royal duties, the wages of the crews were made the same as on board the Spanish men-of-war, and they were commanded to obey Columbus in all things and to sail wherever he commanded. The Admiral, however, was instructed not to sail to the Portuguese Mine of St. George, in Guinea, or to any recently discovered possession of Portugal on the Coast of Africa or in the Atlantic Ocean. Certain privileges were accorded to the sailors faithfully doing their duty in the expedition.

Having concluded all his arrangements with the court, and having seen his son handsomely provided for by his appointment as a royal page, Columbus took leave of his most gracious sovereigns, of Don Diego and his friends, and repaired to Palos to pre-

pare for the departure. Again he became the honored guest of the good monks of La Rabida, who rejoiced in the final triumph of their friend. The friendship of the reverend prior of the convent gave Columbus strength and support in hastening his preparations at Palos. On May 25th Father Juan Perez and the Admiral proceeded the church of St. John, and caused the royal orders for two caravels to be solemnly read by a notary in the presence of the alcalde, the magistrates and nearly the whole population of the town. The officials of Palos promised a ready compliance with the royal commands, and the bustle of excitement resounded at Palos and the neighboring town of Moguer. All things assumed a gay and joyous aspect. The Admiral and the prior were the interesting and potent characters in this strange and unique proceeding.

As soon as the excitement of the moment was passed, and the people began to understand the destined course of the expedition, fear paralyzed every heart in Palos. Popular notions of the Atlantic ocean at that day can scarcely now be imagined or believed. However philosophers from most ancient times may have viewed the Atlantic ocean and the earth from a scientific point of view, the masses of the people regarded it with unconquerable fear and abhorrence. It was to them a *Sea of Darkness*; and learned cosmographers united with the ignorant masses in equipping it with frightful dangers and the most monstrous beings. Its waters were black and fetid, alive with ferocious monsters of gigantic size, and possessing strength to drag the largest vessels into the deepest and deadliest gulfs of ocean. So terrible were the demons of the air, that one of them in particular, a fabled bird called the Roc, was so huge and powerful as to be able to attack the largest ships, lift them up in its beak into the clouds and there crush them in its terrible talons, so that mangled human bodies, still palpitating with life, and broken tables, victuals, furniture and armor, fell to the waters below, only to be ferociously gobbled up by the huge mouths of the monsters of the Dark Sea. The announcement of such an expedition only served to revive with increased vividness the traditions of centuries and the superstitions of ancient time. Every map of ocean, even by learned cosmographers, peopled its waters with fearful monsters, demons and giants. Such as escaped the yawning abyss became the prey of hideous animals. Panic pervaded the whole community. The venerable and popular prior, Juan Perez, of La Rabida, endeavored in vain, by daily public exhortations, to allay the fears of the people. Columbus, in a community of veteran mariners and experienced navigators, was the only man willing to sail westward across the the Atlantic. Neither his example nor his reasonings could calm the universal excitement.

Nor could the authority of an officer sent from the royal household, Juan de Peñasola, nor the penalties and fines he imposed by royal authority, accomplish more than the forcible seizure of a small caravel, the *Pinta*, which belonged to Gomez Rascon and Cristobal Qintero of Palos. Even now, when the *Pinta* came to be repaired and made seaworthy, such was the disaffection of its owners and of the mechanics and people of Palos towards so rash and impracticable a voyage, and that too by a foreigner and adventurer and an alleged deceiver of the royal credulity, that no progress could be made in the preparations. The ship carpenters and caulkers fell ill or concealed themselves; neither wood, tar, oakum, cables or other materials or equipments could be obtained even in a maritime city. Columbus felt that if such were the difficulties experienced in the struggle for one little caravel, how could he hope ever to obtain the three vessels that were needed for the discovery of the New World? Under such circumstances it becomes particularly interesting, especially now in an age not favorable to the monastic orders, to relate how a monk of the fifteenth century threw himself into the breach and labored for the success of the most momentous and fruitful maritime expedition ever undertaken in any century of the world's history. This I will relate in the earnest words of the Count Roselly de Lorgues: "In this critical situation, the zeal of Father Juan Perez came to the aid of his friend and of the misguided people. The Franciscan from the poorness of his living, and the coarseness of his garb, is naturally sympathetic with the people. He is loved, because he evidently loves. His modest familiarity attracts while his devotedness attaches him. The superior of La Rabida, moreover, enjoyed a personal consideration among seamen. He mixed with the sailors, jesting at their terrors, and tranquilizing the minds of their families, and went, making the enrollment, by his words and by his influence, even to the neighboring ports. The zealous Franciscan expected from this expedition the extension of the kingdom of Jesus Christ, a great glory for the Church, and great advantage to civilization. He felt, as had been so justly said by the queen, that Columbus went into the oceanic regions to accomplish great things for the service of God. As a Catholic he took an active part in the good work and prided himself in co-operating in the apostolate of his guest; thus endeavoring to realize the wish of the founder of the Seraphic Order, whose zeal sought to preach Jesus Christ, His cross, and His holy poverty, throughout the whole universe. Thus Father Juan labored, with heart and soul, to change the poltroons into men of courage, and to decide the irresolute."

It was now that the Pinzons providentially appeared on the busy scene, and secured the success of the embarkation. Here

too the Franciscan monk was the potent agent of the crisis. He had before, when Columbus took refuge at the convent from the disappointments experienced at court, sent for Martin Alonzo Pinzon together with Dr. Garcia Fernandez of Palos, for Pinzon was a sea-captain of great experience and fame, as well as a man of liberal fortune, and he belonged to a successful and wealthy family. Impressed at that time with the policy of Columbus, Pinzon, now at the very moment of direst dejection, came forward and offered to join Columbus in the expedition. It is with good reason that that learned publicist and historian, Francesco Tarducci, recognized in this sudden and almost unaccountable event, one of those providential occurrences so often repeated in the after-life of the Admiral, when Providence evidently stood between him and ruin, and even between him and death. The three Pinzon brothers, Martin Alonzo, Francisco Martin and Vicente Yañez, not only gave their money and services to Columbus for the expedition, but the youngest of the three Pinzons, Vicente Yañez, gave his staunch and beautiful little caravel, the *Niña*, to the dread adventure. Great excitement prevailed at Palos when it became the gossip of the old town that the Pinzons, such men of wealth, of maritime experience, of renowned skill in navigation, of such recognized prudence and good judgment, had joined the cause of Columbus.

It was no new sailor's-yarn, when it was bruited about the docks and shipping, in the homes, and around the churches of Palos, that even "Old Martin" was, himself, going to make the venture with this arch adventurer, and to sail down into the Sea of Darkness in the little *Niña*. The relations and friends of the Pinzons now flocked to join the expedition. The town of Palos supplied the third vessel, an old and sea-worn carrack, which was scarcely seaworthy, large though solid, the caravel *Gallego*; and now the work of equipment went on right generously. The Pinzons actively superintended the preparation of the three ships, and they evinced their confidence in the Admiral and his expedition by the important steps they took in providing him with the means, by advancing one-eighth of the cost of the expedition, thus making him a partner with the sovereigns in the profits of the venture. In the meantime, Columbus spent his time chiefly in prayer, meditation, and devout observances, at the convent of La Rabida, the guest of the good prior. It was now that he allied himself with the Seraphic Order, by becoming a member of the grand Order of St. Francis. He paid opportune and not infrequent visits to the port of Palos, to inspect the progress of the work of preparation, and to stimulate and encourage the Pinzons, the crews, and the workmen. It was on one of these visits that the Admiral, coming suddenly upon the scene where the *Pinta* was undergoing

repairs, after her seizure by Peñasola under royal authority, found the caulkers and the workmen at the moment stealthily engaged in so fixing the rudder of the ship as to appear perfectly secure to the casual observer, but the skilled and experienced eye of the Admiral detected the fraud by which they had so contrived as to secure its being unshipped at the least jerk; they thus endeavored to secure the return of the ship and their own friends in the crew by the necessity of sending the ship back before she had sailed many miles. When Columbus ordered the workmen to do their work over again, they absconded, and he was again compelled to resort to compulsion, under royal orders, to secure crews. The energy of Columbus, and his consummate ability finally brought all things in readiness, and by the beginning of August, 1492, the three vessels were ready to sail. The three ships with which Columbus sailed to the discovery of a New World, and to the solution of the great scientific problems of the Earth, though accepted by Columbus as sufficient, and the best possible, were disgracefully unfit for the service. With masterly genius, and unerring sagacity, Columbus realized the situation; miserable as was the equipment, it was the best possible; it had even cost a sacrifice on all sides to accomplish it, such as it was. Not a seaman, not a captain, in this nineteenth century, would, with such vessels, venture on an ordinary voyage over an ocean now familiar to us all. Such was the inadequate fleet that was, four hundred years ago, to brave for the first time the dread ocean—Sea of Darkness and of Death. It accomplished its appalling task! Columbus fulfilled his mission!

The Admiral's flag was hoisted on the Gallego, whose name was now changed by him to the *Santa Maria*, and the ship was placed under the special intercession of the Virgin Mother. The flag was the banner of a Crucified Saviour. On the flag-ship were embarked the Admiral's staff, and other principal officers, such as Diego de Arana, high-constable, and a near relative of Beatrix Enriquez, the Admiral's second wife; Pedro Gutierrez, chief accountant; Roderigo Sanchez of Segovia, comptroller; Roderigo de Escovedo, royal notary; Bernadino de Tapia, historiographer of the expedition; the converted Jew, Louis de Torres, an accomplished linguist, who, it was thought, might converse with the natives in some of the oriental languages of Asia, which was the continent they sought. The Admiral, in accordance with then-existing Spanish custom with men of rank, carried a number of ship's mates or pilots, and also esquires, on his personal staff; among his followers were such men as Pedro Alonzo Niño, Bartolomé Roldan, Sancho Ruiz, Diego Mendez, Francesco Ximenes Roldan, and Diego de Salcedo—some of whom afterwards won an unenviable notoriety.

Such was the local feeling in Palos against Columbus and his enterprise, that his own flag-ship had received not an officer nor a man nor a sailor from that place. It is true, Palos gave the Pinzons to the expedition, without whose co-operation it would seem that Columbus could not have succeeded in raising a fleet for the voyage; at least at Palos. It was the Pinzons who prevented Columbus from sailing from another port, and secured to that town the honor and the fame of having sent forth from her port the Admiral and the fleet that discovered America. But, while out of the sixty-six men on board the flag-ship, there were fifty-nine from about Seville, two Genoese, one Englishman, one Irishman, two Portuguese, and one Majorcan; there was not on his ship a man of Palos. Even the name of Pinzon, before so honored, did not come out untarnished. Palos only enjoys the historic renown—for Palos was the port of embarkation.

The other two caravels, the Pinta and the Niña, on the contrary, were officered and manned by the people of Palos and the neighboring town of Moguer, for, on these ships were the three Pinzons, their relatives, friends, and acquaintances. The Pinta was commanded by Martin Alonzo Pinzon, and her officers and sailors numbered thirty. The Niña was under command of Vicente Yanez Pinzon, and the entire crew numbered twenty-four. The three ships forming the expedition carried in all one hundred and twenty officers and men. On board the Pinta, were Gomez Rascon and Christobal Quintero, the owners of the ship, who had been impressed against their wills to go as a part of her crew. Columbus had placed his elder son, Don Diego, with his two friends, Juan Rodriguez Cabezudo and Father Martin Sanchez, of Moguer, for the necessary instruction and preparation for assuming the duties that would be required of him at court as a page to the Spanish Infante, the heir apparent of Ferdinand and Isabella.

Before embarking on his flag-ship, and turning her prow westward, the Admiral went to confession, and afterwards he solemnly and devoutly received Holy Communion from the hands of his ever-faithful friend, the Prior of Rabida. All the officers and men of the expedition reverently followed his pious and manly example; for, indeed, it was religion alone that then gave courage, hope, fortitude, and strength to men about to embark on a voyage to another world—perhaps, a voyage to the realms of eternal fate. The fleet had now only awaited a favorable wind. The elements of nature, creatures of Providence, now favored the brave Admiral and his heroic followers. God speed them and their ships, the Santa Maria, the Pinta, and the Niña, on the morrow, when westward they will sail! God speed the Discoverers of America.

RICHARD H. CLARKE.

CHURCH AND STATE IN FRANCE.

TWENTY-FIVE years ago, in 1867, the eyes of the whole world were turned toward France. In her beautiful capital she had opened the second of her great exhibitions, the most brilliant that had yet been seen, and from far and near, hundreds of thousands came to admire and to learn, whilst the newspapers spread in every direction their vivid descriptions of all the wonderful products of nature and of human art that had been brought to compete for supremacy from every quarter of the globe. The solemn award of prizes was the crowning of the great event. Under the richly decorated roof of the *Palais de l'Industrie*, were gathered over thirty thousand spectators, comprising the very elite of the civilized world. Right and left of the Emperor were seated most of the actual or expectant sovereigns of Europe, and when, at the close of the formal ceremony, the Empress arose and moved along, with that combination of grace and majesty which recalled at each step the poet's description, *incessu patuit dea*, and responded with winning smile to the vociferous greetings awakened on all sides, it looked as if in her person France was proclaimed on that day queen of modern civilization.

As a fact France was then the leading power of Europe. From its inception, the imperial régime had been one of almost unbroken prosperity. The Crimean War and the short campaign which freed Italy, had given fresh lustre to the imperial eagles, whilst the arts of peace advanced with a rapidity hitherto unknown. Business flourished in every shape. Manufacturing grew in spite of foreign competition. Commercial treaties opened up an ever-widening market abroad to the staple products of the country—to her wines, her silks, her exquisite fruits and perfumes—above all to those articles in which the artistic sense and refined taste of the nation shone forth most conspicuously. As a consequence, riches flowed in from all quarters, and in such abundance, that at that time, an able English financier tells us, there was more accumulated wealth in France than in any country in the world.

A few years later all was changed. An unparalleled series of disasters had dragged down Napoleon from his throne and France from the exalted position she had so brilliantly filled. A dark cloud settled upon her; for a time, she was little thought of outside her own narrowed boundaries; popularity, ever on the track of success, had followed the German flag from Paris to Berlin.

By Catholics, however, the old "Christian Kingdom" in whose

great achievements they had often taken pride, could not be entirely forgotten. American Catholics, especially, could not be unmindful of their deep indebtedness, political and religious—to the French people. And to their credit be it said, that debt of gratitude they have on all occasions gladly acknowledged and generously paid. They witnessed with joy the prompt recovery, as a nation, of their old and faithful ally, but, since then, they have been watching with deep concern the growing estrangement, during these latter years, between Church and State, in a country where both were the object of their best wishes.

Indeed the whole condition of things in France is perplexing and puzzling to them, and to most people in America, when they attempt to form to themselves anything like an accurate and consistent conception of it. Thus, they cannot understand what objection the French Clergy can have to a republican form of government, or how the Catholic Church can be persecuted in a Catholic country, or what grievances may not be removed by constitutional agitation and the popular vote; and if they still remain, and if the State continues to be arbitrary and oppressive, why the Church does not at once sever the link that binds them together and assert her inalienable independence. Many are inclined to think that the grievances complained of are much exaggerated, not to say wholly imaginary. Others believe them to be real, but lay the principal blame on the Catholics themselves, more still, on their priests and bishops, who are supposed to be behind the times and out of sympathy with the spirit and aspirations of the people.

Such perplexities and conflicting views are perfectly natural. Few people are in a position to appreciate correctly the condition, if at all complicated, of any country but their own. To have visited others and to have conversed with some of the inhabitants, will not make them much wiser. Problems depending on numberless facts and agencies can be taken in fully only by living among them. Still, as regards France, a fairly correct impression of the condition of things may be gathered from a simple statement of the principal features of the case, and to this we propose to devote the present paper.

I.

Let us at once dispose of the notion that the French clergy have any decided or wide-spread objection to the Republican form of government, as such. We say without hesitation that, as a body, they have none. A Paris newspaper recently put the question to priests judiciously selected all over the country, and the answer came back, substantially confirming our statement. In those parts of France where the old traditions of the monarchy still survive it

is only natural that the clergy should share in them. Nor should we be surprised to find even outside such influences, many priests who, in common with some of the most thoughtful and ablest men in France, have been led to the conclusion that the republican form of government is ill suited to the temperament of the French people. History certainly goes far to sustain them in their belief. France had lived and flourished for centuries as a monarchy. Her whole political and social life had been cast in that mould. Her brightest memories belonged to it. She had never been so great as under the impulse and guidance of a single mind and a single will. With others it might be otherwise. Ancient Greece and Rome had been at their best as republics. In modern nations, such as America, suddenly sprung to life, with no roots in the past, no historical traditions, the republican form of government was doubtless the most suitable, not to say the only suitable one. But it was entirely out of harmony, they maintained, with the genius of France; nor was this a mere conjecture. Twice already within the last hundred years republican institutions had been tried in their midst and had singularly failed. In the first instance they had steeped the country in blood; in the second, they had led it to the very verge of socialism. And now a third trial was being given which promised little better, each succeeding year leading to a more open and more determined hostility to all religious belief and religious influence. Surely all this was more than sufficient to inspire in many members of the clergy an attitude of reserve, not to say of positive distrust, towards the new Republic. This was the predominant feeling, at the outset, of the wisest and best men in the country. Only those of exactly the opposite kind exhibited any enthusiasm. All the worst elements of society hailed the advent of "*la Republique*." "I should like to be a republican myself," a friend of ours once remarked. "But I am deterred by the sort of company in which I should find myself." Originally the Republic had been proclaimed in Paris after the crushing defeat of Sedan, in 1870, only by an excited crowd, and acquiesced in by the country only as a necessity. During the war and the few years of exhaustion that followed, it remained as a temporary arrangement. Even when the obstinacy of the Comte de Chambord led to making it definitive in 1875, many of those who voted for the republican constitution, saw nothing final in it, and its very framers only asked that it might get a fair trial.

The trial it has had for the last seventeen years—as fair as its best friends could have wished for. Death came most timely to the assistance of the new Republic, by removing its two greatest perils, Comte de Chambord on one side and the Prince Imperial on the other. The Orleans family, however estimable, had no

hold on the country, and could win favor only by the promise of a policy of wisdom and moderation, which it was open to the Republic at any time to adopt and to follow. In what manner it availed itself of the opportunity, we shall soon see. But from now we may observe that, from the very nature of the case, it depended entirely on the French republic itself to win or to estrange the good will of the French clergy.

That clergy had been in complete sympathy with the popular cause in the earlier and only reasonable phase of the great French Revolution. In that of 1848, it cordially welcomed the second Republic. In 1871 it quietly awaited developments, ever ready to abide by the decision of the wisest, and only solicitous to secure fair play and free action for itself. In the beginning of the second empire, from '52 to '57, it had found both, and it only took those five years to win over the great majority of French priests to the imperial dynasty. Still less time would have sufficed to make them staunch supporters of the Republic.

II.

But it seemed as if the latter had resolved from the beginning to discountenance any such disposition on their part. Even before they reached power, the advanced or "republican" party, as they called themselves, had already raised the war cry "Down with clericalism"; and it soon became visible that by clericalism was meant not merely priestly, but all religious influence. Since then, without intermission, steadily, methodically, the government of France has labored, wherever it dared and whenever it could, to uproot and destroy the faith and religion of the French people. Only those who have followed with attention and in detail the course of events for the last fifteen years can realize the full truth of such an indictment. It is, of course, officially denied, and has been so repeatedly. But a thin veil of hypocritical protest cannot hide patent facts, and the facts reveal an unmistakable effort to banish all trace of religion from the institutions of the country, and ultimately from the convictions and hearts of the people. It is doubtful whether the worst enemies of the Faith could have done more. An open, violent persecution would have opened the eyes of the people and led to a reaction. The policy accordingly was to proceed cautiously, to attempt only what would be tolerated or condoned, or what might be denied or plausibly accounted for. Measures of doubtful success were introduced by irresponsible members of the legislature. The mind of the country was felt by the government newspapers, and gradually prepared, when possible, for measures which, if openly endorsed by the government at the outset, would have led to defeat. Gambetta, the prophet of

the new Republic, had left behind him a recommendation to proceed warily and steadily. "To disable a powerful machine," he said, "it is not necessary to break it to pieces. A little sand continuously dropped into its cogs and wheels will soon bring it to a standstill." If we would know how the methods of that intense hater of priests and religion have been carried out, we have only to turn to the protest put forth on the 16th January of the present year by the Cardinals of France and adhered to by the whole French Episcopate.

That weighty document has been widely circulated in this country and doubtless has come under the notice of most of our readers. It is no mere transient expression of disappointment or displeasure, no exaggerated statement of insignificant grievances. It is the deliberate result of a lengthened and painful experience, of hoping far beyond all reasonable hope, and trusting the bland assurances of government until it would have been more than childish to trust them any longer.

To substantiate the episcopal verdict, it would be necessary to describe in detail all the vexatious measures enacted or sanctioned by the republican government for the last ten or fifteen years. The bishops refer to them in general terms, as to things only too well known to the Clergy and to the faithful. We must confine ourselves here to calling attention to their more salient features.

III.

I. The first grievance set forth in the protest is the manifest purpose of the Government to remove all trace of religion from its official action in the numberless details of its administrative functions, and banish it from the public life of what had been for ages and still substantially remains a great Catholic nation.

The religion of old countries means much more than the personal faith and practice of any single generation. It is a spirit which has come down from the distant past, and on its way has leavened the whole social mass, informing the manners and habits of the people, fashioning their thoughts and their language, and setting upon almost every feature of their outer life its visible and unmistakable impress. No Catholic brought up amidst Protestant or secular surroundings can forget the impression he experienced on visiting for the first time a country where the true faith had never ceased to prevail; with what deep enjoyment he lighted at each step, on some new and beautiful reminder of Catholic truth; the gorgeous church and the humble shrine, the statues of the Madonna and of the Saints in the public streets and squares, the wayside cross, the picturesque procession; the schools, the hospitals, the charitable institutions of all kinds, bearing visible signs,

within and without, of the Faith which had originated and still sustained them. All this was to him as a new revelation of divine truth; it was like passing from the chilling atmosphere of winter into the balmy softness and fragrance of spring. As to those who live habitually amidst such surroundings, there is not only a joy and a rest for the soul in them, but an abiding power to sustain and strengthen it in times of trial and darkness. There is help for the weak, comfort for the sorrowing, spiritual exaltation for all.

But it is all this that the government would fain destroy, the better to secularize society from top to bottom. Every religious influence dependent on its authority has been set aside or reduced to a minimum. The hospitals and prisons have been practically deprived of their attendant priests, the army of its chaplains. Catholic soldiers, regularly marched on Sundays to their respective churches in Protestant countries, such as England and Germany, cannot even show themselves in a body in any church in France, and what is sadder still, in most places no minor official can perform his duties as a Christian—not even attend at Mass on Sundays and holy days without exposing himself to almost certain destitution or removal.

2. Our readers remember how, failing to obtain from the legislature a special act expelling the religious orders, the government, on the strength of some obsolete enactment which they would never allow to be tested in a court of law, proceeded to drag from their homes hundreds of men who had devoted their lives to the noblest and most unselfish purposes. Scenes were enacted more like what happens in a barbarous, than what could be expected in a civilized country. Doors were forced; churches and chapels closed, valuable property made almost worthless, men, blameless in the eyes of the law, denied the right of dwelling under their own roofs and peaceably pursuing the useful calling of teacher or preacher, the only ones for which the training of their life had especially fitted them.

3. Some few religious societies of men, and many more of women, enjoying a corporative legal status could not be dealt with in this ruthless fashion. But they should be made in some other shape to share the common fate. They taught most of the public schools of France, and, as a rule, with unquestioned success. But they represented and doubtless exercised a religious influence, and so all the government schools of the country have been closed to them. In vain the localities where they taught sent up unanimous petitions to have them reinstated; in vain the "*écoles laïques*" substituted in their place remained empty; in vain, the municipal officers begged to be relieved of the burden put upon their townships to meet only imaginary requirements. It was all to no pur-

pose. The edict had gone forth and should at any cost be carried out; and so, in a country where the bulk of the people had grown up for centuries under religious teachers, such teachers were no longer considered worthy to be entrusted with the training of the future citizens of the new Republic.

4. The hospital nuns fared somewhat better. Enough of the old chivalrous spirit of France remained to protect them from ill treatment and sustain their well earned popularity. Yet in Paris and in several of the larger cities they were driven away from their blessed work by men of the worst type, intense haters of religion, who had succeeded in getting the management of city affairs into their hands. In Paris, all the leading hospital doctors protested repeatedly against the cruelty of depriving their poor patients of the care of kind and experienced nurses, to hand them over to others untrained, unreliable and often of questionable moral character. It was of no avail. Nothing could be laid to the charge of the nuns, no neglect, no undue religious pressure of any kind. They were loved by all the patients. But they were nuns; they wore the garb of religion, and they must go.

5. Still the teaching and hospital sisters continued to subsist. Nuns can live on little, and they die hard. Charitable hands and hearts were opened to them. Other works of Christian pity and love came to life and claimed their devotion. Property still remained in their hands, the patrimony of their present or departed members, or the fruit of their industry and thrifty living, or the gifts of benefactors anxious to have thereby a share in their good works. They could not be despoiled of it by confiscation, as in Italy. But special taxes, artfully contrived and ably worked could lead to the same result, and this is the method that has been adopted. Already the property of religious communities was taxed to its full value and paid as much to the treasury as any other property. But to this was added by a recent law: 1. An income tax based on purely imaginary revenues. 2. An "increase duty," as they call it, which, as has been abundantly demonstrated, would, if strictly applied, eat up in a few years the whole property of religious communities. The Christian Brothers alone would have to pay \$200,000 a year. As a fact, the Little Sisters of the Poor had to pay \$10,000 the first year, or have the homes of their aged poor sold out over their heads. A noble-hearted woman, the wife of President Carnot, paid the amount and solved the difficulty, but only for a twelvemonth.

6. It is by methods of somewhat a similar kind that the French government has undertaken to reduce the secular clergy to a proper degree of subserviency. The priests of France had learned to rely on the miserable allowance guaranteed to them by the

Concordate, and, it must be said, regularly paid them under every form of government since the beginning of the century. They are now no longer sure of getting it. Almost every day we hear of priests forfeiting the slender salary which is their only support, because they are supposed to have spoken some words or done some action considered hostile to the government. There is no trial, no opportunity of denying or explaining. The authorities have satisfied themselves that the men are guilty, and that is the end of it. It is only a short time since the Bishop of Carcassonne was deprived of part of his salary because he had actually gone to Rome without leave of absence! As a fact, no French Bishop thinks of asking it. But the rule is laid down in an obsolete article of the Organic Law, added arbitrarily to the Concordate by Napoleon I., and as the Bishop of Carcassonne was not considered to be friendly, this was adopted as a convenient way of punishing him. It did not hurt him much. To the Minister's letter he simply replied: "I have been to see the Pope, and I mean to do so as often as I deem it useful. You may take my money; I can forfeit it much easier than I could my self-respect and freedom of action."

In various clerical departments the supplies have been completely cut off. The canons of the Cathedral Chapters have no longer the modest stipend which allowed bishops to crown the last years of their most venerable priests with the *otium cum dignitate* they had so well earned. The seminaries no longer receive their wonted subsidies. Whilst nothing is spared on secular education, clerical education from beginning to end is left to shift for itself. But this is nothing when compared with the attempt to poison the very sources of the priesthood by compelling its aspirants to pass through the ordeals of the military service.

7. Military service has been in some measure compulsory ever since the wars of Napoleon I. But even when applied with most rigor, various classes of individuals were exempted, and, among others, priests and young aspirants in course of preparation for the priesthood, the exemption becoming final only by their ordination. It was the judgment of all fair-minded men that youths whose life was to be all turned to purity and piety should not be compelled to live amidst a coarse and licentious soldiery, and that anyhow a whole existence devoted to the service of their fellow-men was more than an equivalent for a few years of idleness spent in garrison with little beyond a bare possibility of active service.

But soon after the consolidation of the Republic, the cry was raised that priests and clerics should no longer be exempted. It was echoed through the country by those known for their hostility to religion, urged on by the radical newspapers, pressed on the

government by the anti-religious section of the legislature, and ultimately incorporated in the Army bill presented to the house. For the last few years this had been held as a threat over the heads of the clergy. The sense of the country was unfavorable to it. The military authorities opposed it. But the radical passions to which the government almost invariably yields were stronger still, and in the year 1890-91 the young seminarists took their place among the recruits of their section. How the measure has worked so far and is likely, if enforced, to work in the future, we are not concerned to examine. What we wish to point out is that it was carried out against the unanimous protests of bishops, priests and all practical Catholics, and in obedience to a feeling of undisguised hostility to clergy and religion in its originators and promoters from beginning to end.

8. The last grievance we wish to refer to regards the schools. Needless to say that with the Christian brothers and the teaching Sisters, all traces of religion were driven from them. The crucifixes were taken down from their walls and sometimes ignominiously thrown aside as worthless rubbish. Neither priest nor bishop may now visit them, except as strangers. Christian doctrine may not be taught on the premises, even after school hours. The textbooks enjoined are often objectionable. In the public schools of Paris the name of God has been expunged from every one of them. The normal schools in which teachers are trained are kept clear of all religious influences. It is barely tolerated in the government colleges, and the religious instruction is optional there. Clerics are strictly excluded from the educational boards, on which, as was natural, they held a place in former times. The school teachers are often notorious unbelievers, and not unfrequently give free expression in presence of their pupils to their contempt for all religious faith and practice. They may be occasionally reprimanded for their indiscretion. If they are removed, it is only to be promoted.

All this condition of things is only the carrying out of the programme laid down from the beginning by what was called the Republican party. If any of its members questioned its wisdom or fairness, he was looked upon with suspicion as a monarchist in disguise. Priests who spoke out against its iniquitous enactments were held up to public execration as enemies of their country. The very men who had done most by their moral authority to win enough wavering members to vote the republican constitution by a *majority of one* were soon set aside, and for the last ten years they have watched sadly the downward course of the movement they had originated and had hoped to guide, their promises disregarded, their wise checks and restraints brushed aside, and that

noble structure under which it was their ambition to welcome the whole nation and secure freedom to all, narrowed down to the size of a masonic lodge.

Can we wonder, then, that bishops and priests were unfriendly to such a régime—that it was still for them only on its trial, and that not successful nor with much likelihood to improve ;—that whilst submitting to the constituted authorities, their thoughts went forth in search of some other form of government which would give them not delusive hopes, but solid pledges of free action and fair play. The Republic had promised both, and if she had given them in any reasonable measure, she would have had no better friends than the clergy. But so long as she chose to do the very opposite, she could expect nothing beyond passive, unloving submission.

Hence the painful surprise awakened in almost the entire Catholic body in France by the appeal of Cardinal Lavigerie towards the close of 1890. It spoke of union in the midst of systematic persecution, of a hearty, unreserved adhesion to a form of government whose representatives had shown themselves almost invariably hostile to Catholic belief and Catholic influence. Submission indeed might be spoken of, had it not been practised as constantly as human nature could admit. But cordial, trustful affection! It was like asking a man thrust out of doors to turn round and shake hands with his assailant. True, many of the clergy had been wanting in wisdom and moderation. But they were the aggrieved parties, and the question of peace remained entirely in the hands of the aggressors. Hence the appeal, whilst much spoken of in other countries, in France remained almost unheeded.

IV.

But here it will be asked—and in presence of the facts just described, the question has doubtless come up more than once before the mind of the reader—what inducement has the French Republic thus to wound the Catholic feeling of the country and make enemies for itself instead of friends? And again, how can it have done so for years without being upset by the popular vote? Perplexing questions indeed, not only for outsiders, but for the French themselves, as may be seen by the variety of answers elicited when the same questions are put to them. We will attempt to throw a little light on the problem in the following pages.

As regards the persistent hostility of the Republican party toward the Church, it can be accounted for in various ways, and first of all by the composition of that party. When, at the close of the war with Germany in 1871, the French people unanimously turned for guidance to their greatest living statesman, Thiers, in

presence of four or five irreconcilable political parties, he said, "I am satisfied to accept a republic. It is the form of government about which we shall disagree least. But I want a republic without the republicans." The republicans—the "true republicans," as they styled themselves, he dreaded, because, as a party, they were led by men of passionate temperament and of extreme radical, not to say revolutionary, principles, and followed by what was worst in the country. Now it is this very party that came to power twelve years ago, and has held its ground ever since. The weight of authority has, it is true, sobered down more than one of the leaders. But the original spirit remains in the body and is ever kept living and active by irresponsible members of the party. Most of them are devoid of all religious belief, some intensely hostile to the Catholic Church. It is only natural that they should injure her, as much as they can with safety to themselves and to their party.

The more moderate, considering her as an element of the political and social problem which it is out of their power to eliminate, would reduce her gradually to a vanishing quantity. Meanwhile they bear with her, but are ever ready to resent any special action or influence of hers in the sphere of public life. They would shut her up in her shrines, far out of sight, to be approached and consulted, like the oracles of old, by those who believe in her supernatural gifts, and leave the world to be guided by secular wisdom to its real end—the greatest and most widely diffused happiness attainable in the present life.

Even those—and there are some—who aim higher and realize the elevating power of the Church, still fail to recognize her divine mission and dread the development of influences positively and properly religious. They would have all the moral and social benefits of the faith, without the beliefs, the organization and the agencies to which they are due. Or if a Church there is to be, it must be a Church aiming at nothing and effecting nothing beyond what suits their purposes.

There is, finally, a large and steadily growing number of men, who, whilst regretting the radical tendencies of their party, and especially its hostility to religion, still cling to it for various reasons, and when it comes to a vote that may seem to imperil the new Republic, they vote with their party. Later on they may support a different policy, that is, when all danger shall have ceased and the republican form of government shall be no more questioned in France than a constitutional monarchy in England.

For it has to be remembered, at no time since it began has the republican constitution of France been out of danger. Up to the day of his untimely death, the Prince Imperial was looked to with

hope by a large section of the people. The intelligence and the wealth of the country have been for years with the Comte de Paris. The faults of the Republican party, the class of men they have put in office, their subserviency to the local politicians, and as a consequence, the weakness and one-sidedness of the whole administration, their lavish expenditure leading to increased taxes and repeated loans, kept as much as possible out of sight, yet clearly realized by the thoughtful as threatening national bankruptcy if not soon put an end to; and at the same time the impossibility that the party should stop its course without losing a support necessary to sustain them—all this and much more has shaken the faith of many who had originally believed in the Republic, and makes them still ready to accept any other form of government that would reassure them as to the future, rid them of arbitrary officials, of village tyrants, and not disgrace their country by placing some of her gravest interests in the hands of men whom they cannot respect.

Add to all this the innate and undying love of the French people for military glory, and their readiness to forget all else for a time, to follow a brilliant and successful soldier, and we can understand how even a man like Boulanger could have had such a following in all classes and all through the country; how the government felt itself on the very brink of destruction, and only escaped by the boldness of its action and the cowardice of the would-be dictator. It is only natural that in such a condition of things the government and the republican majority should look suspiciously on the clergy whose sympathies they had estranged, and decide upon crushing instead of conciliating them.

V.

But then the other question comes up: how *can* they crush them? Is not France a Catholic country? and if so, how, with its manhood suffrage, can it allow its convictions to be ignored, its religious institutions to be broken up, the beneficent action of the clergy impeded at every step, by a government which is of its own making, after all, and utterly dependent on its votes? Or are we to believe that France is only Catholic in name, and that the work of religious destruction which has been pursued is after all only what she consciously or unconsciously wishes for?

The question is a fair one and should be answered fairly. But fairness here means more than superficial observation and misleading generalizations. The anomaly we have to deal with, like most social facts, has its roots deep down in the nature of the people and in its living memories and traditions. It is the outcome of

many present influences, some permanent, others transient and accidental.

We would say then, first, that the French are a Catholic people, but only in a very qualified sense. It is clear that if they were a Catholic people as the Irish, or Belgians, or Spaniards, or as the Catholic population of the United States, none of the religious grievances referred to above could have ever come into existence. In reality the religious condition of France is something very complex and difficult to analyze and describe with anything like accuracy. In France are to be found in large numbers some of the noblest specimens of Christian faith and life the world possesses. Beside them are some of the worst and bitterest enemies of all religion. There are whole provinces where nearly the entire population is heartily Catholic in belief and in practice. There are others where the churches are unfrequented, the sacraments hardly thought of, except by a few women, the priest appealed to only on rare and solemn occasions. Many old religious customs are still kept up, but there is no longer any clear conception or firm hold of the beliefs which give a meaning to them. Up to a recent period, very few failed to receive, when young, their share of the religious instruction so carefully given to children. But, unsupported by domestic and social influences, these early religious impressions are neither deep nor abiding, and each succeeding generation emerges into manhood, sometimes,—in the cities—openly irreligious, but mostly indifferent, skeptical, deistical at best, with a traditional tinge of Christianity. They are not bad men, as a rule; the rural population are hard-working, thrifty, honest in their dealings, kindly withal and helpful to their neighbors. They would make fairly good Protestants; but that is the last thing they would think of. They like to have a priest, the same as the people around them, to baptize their children, to marry their sons and daughters, to anoint themselves when the end is near and they are already unconscious, and to bury them respectably from the church when they die. Such people, though all baptized, we can hardly call Christians.

Finally, in most parts of France we find the two classes mingled in varying proportions. In cities and towns the contrast between them is more marked, the religious section being more demonstrative in its faith, and the unbelieving more openly hostile.

Taking the whole population of the country as it stands, a legislature faithfully reflecting its feeling towards religion would not be unfriendly to the Church. But in this as in many other particulars, the popular vote does not reflect the popular mind. Issues unfamiliar and confusing are artfully introduced to mislead the voter. His ignorance is abused, his credulity played upon, and the result is the return to the legislature of men who, if known,

would never have won his confidence. The truth is, the French voter; as a rule, has no political education. In country places he seldom reads a newspaper; in the cities he finds them in abundance, but almost invariably chooses the worst. Nobody accustomed to the press of this country can form any conception of the utter unfairness and disregard for truth which characterize the organs of the French press most widely circulated among the lower classes. The silliest reports are given as ascertained facts. Insinuations of the worst kind are indulged in, inconvenient happenings carefully kept out of sight, others eagerly grasped at and magnified, in a word a travestied picture of things steadily held up before their readers.

As a consequence, the bulk of the people have only a very imperfect and incorrect conception of the issues involved in an election or of the men who solicit their suffrage, and thus become an easy prey to the unscrupulous agents and candidates who work themselves into their confidence. The worst feature in them is that they distrust their natural guides. The masses in France will not listen to political advice coming from any one above them unless he makes himself as one of them. An employer of labor may be ever so kind to his workmen and on the best terms with them. On election day they are sure to vote for the candidate he most objects to. In many places the priest shares in the same distrust. He must not talk politics to his people. It will not influence their vote to any extent and they count it as an unwarrantable intrusion. But the government officials spread all over the country are expected to do their utmost for the government candidate, and many of them know that their position, present and prospective, depends on his success.

Thus it comes to pass that even a good Catholic population will send up to the legislature a representative hostile to religion. He finds little difficulty in calming their conscientious scruples. He pledges himself on the one hand that no harm shall be done to religion, and on the other he holds out, if successful, the most tempting prospects of government favors—roads, bridges, railway extensions, appointments of all kinds.

But the popular interests are appealed to in another and a broader way. The French peasantry, who form the bulk of the population, are, as we have said, hard working, orderly, and anticipate nothing but trouble from any political change. Security of person and property being about all they expect from the best of governments, so long as they enjoy it and are doing fairly well, they hate the very notion of a change. In other words, whether they live under an emperor, a king or a president, they are intensely conservative. As a consequence, even though a government can-

didate be deficient in many ways and far less estimable than his opponent, they will vote for him and not for the one who would upset the government, make trouble, bring on war perhaps, and other calamities known and unknown besides. The priests it is true, complain, they say, but so far their salary has not been withdrawn. Anyhow they are well able to take care of themselves, and people are not going to upset everything to please them.

Yet all this could not sufficiently account for the fact of the radicals remaining in power so long, though a minority in the country, if we did not add one more all-important factor—the existence in the radical party, of a strong, wide-spread, well disciplined organization, and the failure of the conservative party to establish anything to compete with it.

The republicans in the legislature are divided among themselves on many points, but on most others, especially on the fundamental dogma of republican institutions they are in perfect agreement, work together, under the recognized leadership of a few among them, and are ever ready to sacrifice their own judgment to the general interests of the party and the guidance of its chiefs. Outside the house, they have built up a powerful press, in Paris and in every part of the country. They have extended a network of agencies, more or less connected with freemasonry, over the whole surface of the land, and are thus able to disseminate all manner of impressions favorable to their cause, prepare elections, local and general, dispose the public mind for or against certain measures in contemplation. Finally, they have shown remarkable energy and perseverance in carrying out their programme, in individual instances a great devotion to the cause, in short a political spirit not unworthy of nations long accustomed to popular government.

The conservative party have tried to organize in a similar way, but without any great success. Their difficulties it is true were greater. Conservatism itself was too shadowy a basis to build upon. Legitimists, Orleanists and Bonapartists, all monarchists, could not agree on the monarchs to recognize. The defence of religious interests was a platform good enough and clear enough in its way, but insufficient, without a political programme, to keep a political party together. And when an attempt was made to carry out the so-called religious policy, it was found that instead of new men, only the champions of past years were forthcoming—honorable and true, but having no records except of failure, and as was said, "only monarchists in disguise." Besides they had no recognized leader at any time, no man strong enough to impose a policy and compel obedience. Outside the legislature there were some desultory attempts to enlighten the public by the diffusion of prints and newspapers. But here again the radical vice of the

system was felt—the absence of a political programme. The various factions worked principally for their own purposes. Up to the death of the Comte de Chambord, the legitimists were irreconcilable. For them no political or religious change deserved attention unless it led to a restoration which, once effected, would prove a universal remedy.

The spirit of compromise—the very essence of political combination—is strikingly deficient in the French character, and on no occasion has its absence been more distinctly and painfully felt than in the inability of the conservatives to merge their differences in a common effort to rid the country of a rule which they all agreed to look upon as disastrous and debasing. Whilst their opponents were weak, they quarrelled among themselves; when at last they attempted to combine, it was too late. Even among the clergy, there was no plianthood, no unity of action, no guidance. The bishops were not agreed on any definite policy, and the counsels that came from Rome were rather of a negative kind and only served to dishearten the more resolute among them. On the other hand, such of the clergy as were accessible to worldly considerations were paralyzed at the very outset; for any active opposition to the policy of the government was sure to close against them all access to ecclesiastical preferment dependent upon State sanction. It is true their fault, as a body, does not lie in that direction. It is rather in their extreme, uncompromising spirit, more generous than enlightened, and wasting itself too often on impracticable, unattainable ends.

It is in the midst of this condition of things that the Declaration of Cardinals already referred to was published. What seems to have attracted most attention outside France is their recommendation to the Catholic clergy and laity “to accept henceforth, without reservation the political institutions of the country.” But for those familiar with the real state of affairs, this could not mean much. To recommend a passive acceptance of present institutions would be superfluous, inasmuch as they are enforced by the whole power of the law; neither is there any prospect of their being altered in the near future sufficient to justify an open constitutional agitation against them. But if, by unreserved acceptance is meant abandonment of all hope, or wish, or readiness to strive for another form of government, if ever a chance offered, we doubt very much whether the believers in a monarchy will take the advice to heart, or whether even the clergy, whilst more reserved in showing to which side they lean, will feel bound henceforth to relinquish their personal judgment and personal sympathies. Neither are the relations with the Republican party and with the government likely to be much modified. For the Cardinals invite protest and active oppo-

sition to the vexatious legislation of which we have spoken whilst Republican organs continue to look upon these very laws as essential elements of a genuine republic, and cabinet Ministers formally state before the Senate that they consider them as "an integral and accessory part of the great work which they slowly and deliberately elaborated since they came to power—never to be touched again."

Thus, then, the attempt at pacification promises to lead to nothing, and it only remains for the Church to keep up the fight. Happily she can do so with every chance of ultimate success, if only she decides to pursue it on other lines.

VI.

Recent experience has taught her that even a legal recognition of her claims can give no permanent security, unless it is based on the abiding sense of the country. What one legislature grants another can take away. She has found out that there is such a thing as being too successful, and that it is better to get less with the good will of all, than by getting more to awaken opposition and enmity. Looking back to the period immediately following the war with Germany, it is manifest that the majority in the legislature was far more Catholic than the country at large; that the claims of the clergy grew in proportion with the readiness of that majority to meet them; and that, although the concessions effectively made were anything but exorbitant, still they were calculated to alarm a people extremely sensitive to religious pressure. At the same time the action of the clergy, instead of being quiet and unobtrusive, was often demonstrative, not to say noisy and aggressive, in a way which could not fail to lead to a reaction. Many who, though with little or no belief themselves, had a genuine respect for religion and would find no fault with those who practised it sincerely, were roused to opposition when they witnessed what they called an attempt to capture the country and impose a purely Catholic régime on a people so deeply divided in the matter of religious beliefs. The feeling was naturally intensified in those openly opposed to all Christian faith, and unhappily the two classes together included a large majority of the active and militant political men of the country. Gambetta was their leader, and he it was that raised the alarm by pointing out clerical ascendancy as the peril of the hour. "*Le cléricalisme, voilà l'ennemi*" became the watchword and the war-cry of the party, and led step by step to all those repressive and hostile measures which we have set before our readers. Some of the worst would have probably not been carried if the clergy had been more prudent and more careful to deal gently with public opinion,

to gauge it more accurately and to cultivate it with greater assiduity and tact.

But this would be perhaps expecting too much. The French clergy, as a body—and, indeed, the same may be said of the great majority of educated Frenchmen—are strangely ignorant of the true condition of public opinion on questions which divide the country. They read the papers of their party and will read no others. In reality they do not want to know the full truth. It is far pleasanter to be told that all is right on their side and wrong on that of their opponents. Facts the most significant and tendencies leading to the greatest results reach them, if at all, in an imperfect and often distorted shape. And because they see not far, they invariably picture to themselves the whole country merely as an enlargement of the surroundings with which they are familiar. It is not easy for most priests to go farther. The hostile papers are so unfair that it is difficult to extract the honest truth from them. And then a priest who reads them and gathers broadness and moderation from them is liable to be looked upon with suspicion by his fellow priests and by the “right-minded” people with whom he associates. The intolerance of both classes in this particular, especially of the former, goes beyond anything a born American can form a conception of.

And yet public opinion, in France as in all modern countries, is the great Court of Appeal before which all disputed cases of public policy have to come up for a final decision. The supreme power has gone back to its original human source—the people. It is they that have ultimately to be dealt with, and, if possible, to be won. In his letter to Cardinal Gibbons in relation to the Knights of Labor, Cardinal Manning remarks that the Church formerly dealt with princes, because in them resided what there was of authority. But gradually power has forsaken the throne and dwelt with lords and parliaments until it has come down to the lower strata of society. “And now,” he says, “a new task is before us. The Church has no longer to deal with parliaments and princes but with the masses and with the people. Whether we will or no, this is our work. We need a new spirit and a new law of life.” Our readers will remember how nobly and feelingly the American Cardinal echoed the pregnant words of his venerable brother of Westminster.

Here, then, is a lesson well deserving to be taken to heart by all, and above all by the Clergy of France. For, if we may say it, they are not as much in sympathy with the people as in other Catholic countries, surely not as much as they possibly might and should be.

That they love their people, that they are devoted to their in-

terests, spiritual and temporal, self-forgetting in their service and helpful whenever appealed to, nobody knowing them will be tempted to deny. In fact, as priests, the people give them credit for being all they ought to be, and sincerely reverence and trust them in their official capacity. But men are concerned about many things besides their souls and their bodies. They want to be understood, appreciated, to find sympathy in those with whom they have to deal, not for what is admittedly evil, but for what they look upon as most desirable and best. Such are for them their political and social ideals, their aspirations to liberty, to freedom of action and thought, to a share in the direction of public affairs, general and local, equality, dislike of unlimited, arbitrary or irresponsible power, freedom of the press, a right to organize labor and combine for all legitimate purposes. These and many other objects of a similar kind captivate the popular mind. In a certain measure they are all legitimate and many of them positively beneficent. Beyond that they are an evil and from the beginning they are a danger, because of the facility with which they run into excess. Now the people have a lively sense of what is good in them and can scarce see anything else. The priest, on the contrary, ever on the watch to ward off evil, can hardly see anything but the perils they lead to. He is accordingly induced to throw the whole weight of his influence against them, and thus finds himself out of sympathy with the people, whilst seeking only to be faithful to his duty.

But his conception of duty in this regard may often be a mistaken one. A broader view of things might lead him to opposite conclusions. It would certainly show him that to hope, and trust, and reckon on the power of patience and love, is not less a duty than to restrain or to rebuke; that the dominant tendencies of an age cannot be stayed; that, like the mountain torrent, accumulated obstacles only add to their destructive power, and that the only thing possible is to limit and to guide them. But limitation and guidance are accepted only from those whose sympathies are undoubted.

This, we know, is the secret of the power which the popular leaders of the day exercise over their followers. They are in touch with them. They share, or seem to share, all their aspirations. They give expression and power to the principles and the impulses dimly and dumbly moving in the popular mind. This manner of action is ever open to the priest and only through it can he reach the hearts of the people. The sacredness of his character and his virtuous life may win the respect of a religious population, not unfrequently even of unbelievers. But only a clergy that shares their joys, their hopes, the secret longings of their

hearts, can ever be their acknowledged guides. The case of Ireland comes up of itself before the mind as an example. But the same is true of Belgium, of Catholic Germany, of every other country where priests and people have fought together for faith and for Church. The religious bond alone would not have sufficed to keep them united in action. There had to be, besides, the human element of common interests and common sympathies—what the Hebrew prophet calls “The cords of Adam—the bands of love.”

In one sense nothing should be easier to the French clergy; for although all classes of society are represented among them, as a body they spring from the people; in infancy and in early youth at least, they have thought and felt and hoped and feared with the people. Later on, it is true, other influences have come and gradually weakened the bond. They have been taken and cast into a mould in which not a few precious elements of their earlier life too often disappeared. It is the danger of all schools of special training, whatever their object, to disregard, not only the antecedent mental and moral conditions of those they undertake to form, but even the full scope of their future action, in order to fit them the better for the one principal function at which they aim. But the results are often unsatisfactory. Such schools make artists, engineers, soldiers, priests. They often fail to make men. Yet a priest has to remain to the end a man, and a man of the people, like the Son of Man, his Master and Model, who chose to embrace all human sympathies in his heart, “to be made like unto his brethren, as St. Paul says, tempted in all things as we are, without sin . . . that he might become a merciful and faithful high-priest before God.” Through youth and early manhood, during the whole course of his training, whilst opening widely his soul to the spirit of the Gospel and to the traditional spirit of the Catholic priesthood, the aspirant has to keep alive his first love for what is good and generous and hopeful in the age and in the people to which he belongs. Thus he may go back to them, not as one who has imbibed the prejudices of a foreign country and forgotten his native tongue, but as one who returns to a home which he has never ceased to think of and to love.

This the priests of France are coming to realize, slowly it is true, but steadily. Once fully alive to the fact, they will act on it, and with that wonderful pliancy which they have exhibited as missionaries all over the world, making themselves at home amid the most varied forms and degrees of civilization, and winning numberless souls to Christ, “of all nations and tribes and peoples and tongues,” surely the task of accommodating themselves to the prevailing spirit of their own people will prove an easy and a pleasant one.

The difficulty will be to persevere after the first attempts will have failed to awaken a responsive echo. For they will not unfrequently find between them and the hearts of the people a crust of prejudice often hard to break and ever ready to re-form. Strange to say, there prevails very widely through the country a sort of mysterious fear or distrust of the priest—not of the individual priest, but of the clergy. It is almost entirely confined to the lower classes, and is often half unconscious. If questioned, they may honestly deny it, and if they acknowledge, they cannot justify it. But it is there, just like the feeling of so many Protestants in this country regarding Catholics and their priests, nothing in particular to object to, perhaps much to admire—but, behind it all, a suspicion of secret, dangerous combinations and aims which have to be watched, whilst the operators must be made powerless to do harm. How such a feeling came to be implanted in a Catholic people, it is extremely difficult to explain. It is doubtless in a measure a lingering tradition of the now distant past in which the economic interests of the clergy and of the people were antagonistic and conflicting; doubtless also it is somewhat due to the very separateness in which the priest has to live, and to the awkwardness naturally felt by so many men committed by baptism and outward profession to a religion which they do not choose to practise. The temperament also of the nation, trustful to a fault, yet as Carlyle remarks, preternaturally suspicious, once suspicion is awakened, helps to account for it. And last, but not least, there is the silly yet abiding apprehension of priests getting power and using it to compel people to be religious whether they like it or not.

Whatever the cause, the effect is there. For many a good and noble-hearted priest it has been the hardest of burdens to bear, and it will remain, so long as it lasts, the difficulty most dreaded by those who come to the people with hearts full of sympathy and love.

Another, keenly felt in many places and hard to remove, arises from the unfriendly relations so prevalent in France between “the masses and the classes.” It is the natural wish of the priest to be on good terms with both. His relations with the old French families, especially, are of a kind to compensate for what is denied him elsewhere. It is one of genuine mutual confidence. In the priest they find a man of education with whom they may converse on many topics, a safe and convenient channel for their charities, in times of emergency and trial, a guide and a friend. In return, their thoughtful kindness is ever adding to the beauty of his church and to the modest comforts of his home. He is at all times their welcome guest. But his acceptance of their hospi-

talities easily become a popular grievance. Whoever associates with them is supposed to side with them, and as a consequence, comes in for his share of the distrust and dislike with which they are regarded—often most unjustly—by the lower classes.

To steer an even course between the two parties until he has reconciled them together will require tact, patience and self-forgetting in no ordinary degree. But then there is no other body of men who more than the clergy of France can be looked to with assurance for the generous practice of such virtues.

To conclude: Church and State in France have been and still remain at war. The nature of that war, its causes and responsibilities we have endeavored to set before the reader as accurately and as fully as possible. The picture is not a bright one. To some of our readers it will seem disheartening. But those who know the country best, do not share that feeling. *Violentum non durat* is a proverb of universal truth, but doubly true of the French people. And there is in them besides a sort of undying youth underlying the seeming tokens of decay, which may burst forth any day in forms of life as new and beautiful as unexpected. In France it is really the unexpected that happens.

Hence, whilst there is much reason to be sad, there is far less to be discouraged. In what way France may recover herself religiously men can only conjecture. Separation between Church and State are just now much spoken of. Neither the Pope nor the French government are favorable to it. But there is a power in the very condition of things which overrules the strongest wills.

One thing seems certain. This time the Republic has come to stay, and only the greatest faults can henceforth imperil its existence. The only practical course open to the Church is that suggested by Leo XIII., and clearly pointed out by the Cardinals; to bow to the constitution once for all, and then, by the broadness of her sympathies and by her deep, untiring, unselfish love, to win back the loyalty and trust of a people whose pride for centuries it has been to do God's work under her guidance, "*gesta Dei per Francos*."

J. HOGAN.

P. S.—Since the above was written, two important events have emphasized the cross-currents of contemporary history in France, but so far without sensibly modifying their direction: we refer to the recent Papal Encyclical addressed on the 16th of February "to the Catholic Archbishops, Bishops, Clergy and Faithful of France," and to the bill on "Associations" which led recently to the fall of the French Ministry. In his Encyclical Leo XIII. gives public and solemn expression to the policy which he has been known to

favor for a long time, and which he was wont to recommend to those who sought to be guided by his wisdom. The document is in substantial agreement with the manifesto of the Cardinals and Bishops, recognizing in general terms the reality of the grievances they set forth, and summoning the Catholics of the country to unite with them in resenting and resisting the anti-religious laws enacted in the course of these latter years. But, whilst in the episcopal document the political question is kept in the background and touched upon lightly, it becomes the prominent feature of the Pontifical announcement. Drawing a distinction between the Constitution which France has acquiesced in and clings to, and the course of anti-religious legislation which is being pursued, Leo XIII. declares that the former should be respected, but that all should unite in combating the latter.

That much good will come of this wise and timely advice, there can be no doubt; in fact it is already visible in many shapes, which at the last moment we cannot stop to consider. Yet in no degree does it seem to have disarmed the hostility of the "Republican" party towards the Church. Indeed the salutary warnings of the Pope as to the essential dependence of social order on morality, and ultimately on Religion, would appear to irritate them more and more.

Their feelings have found a natural expression in the bill presented by the Government on "Associations" in general, but unmistakably meant to give a fatal blow to all religious societies. If voted by the legislature, it would have placed every religious body in the country, and ultimately the Church herself at the mercy of a power, arbitrary, unscrupulous and openly hostile.

For the present it is dropped. But the spirit which dictated its insidious clauses is as much alive and as active as ever. After a few days of ministerial crisis, the same men, with two or three exceptions, came back to power, and their attitude towards the Church is in nowise improved. The formal acceptance of the Republican Constitution by the Pope and Bishops has not in the least altered the feelings or the language of their party. Catholics are plainly told by the radical press that their sympathies are neither sought for nor believed in. The latest accounts tell of fresh threats uttered by the new premier and of fresh acts of petty tyranny. It remains to be seen whether the country consulted in the next elections will ratify such action.

J. H.

THE LAST OF THREE GREAT ENGLISH
CARDINALS—HIS SPECIAL WORK.

WHEN Napoleon the First was at St. Helena, withering in his miserable exile, he had a conversation with an attendant about "greatness," or as to what constituted the true idea of being "great." He said that our Divine Lord was truly great, because He succeeded in making the whole human family love Him; but that, for himself, he could not claim any greatness, since his career had inspired fear, but not love. We can imagine "Napoleon the Great" regarding his whole life as a failure, because he would die with scarcely one friend to regret him. Not greatness but smallness was such an end. And it has been the end of not a few of the world's heroes. The number of those great ones who have been great in the world's love, has been less even than of those whom the world respected. Mere respect is often rendered to mere success; but the world gives its heart to the good alone.

A great man has recently died in England, whose greatness was emphatically his goodness. Cardinal Manning was not revered for his grand abilities, nor was he renowned as a great preacher or public orator; nor was he looked upon as a commanding figure on this world's stage, nor as an embodiment of any captivating idea. In all such aspects he was far away above ordinary men; still, he could only be said to be "typical" as to his asceticism. He was profoundly esteemed for the splendid charities of his career; for the grand activities of his generous nature and saintly soul; for the holy example he set of a self-denying life; and, above all, for his championship of the poor. If we ask, what was that one sovereign trait which endeared Cardinal Manning to the multitude, so much so as to make him "great in the world's love," we shall find the answer in many scores of "resolutions" which were passed by Laborers' Unions in Great Britain, so soon as it became known that he was dead; resolutions all conveying the profound regret at the loss of a friend who "had endeared himself to the heart of every working man by the profound interest he ever exhibited in his welfare," or, "by the noble earnestness with which he fought the cause of the oppressed," or, "by his championship of the just rights of the laboring classes." Here was the real secret of the "greatness." The name of Manning was as a household word with the English poor, and this, perhaps, equally among Protestants and among Catholics.

Let us recall, for a moment, two other English cardinals, both of whom were profoundly venerated by Catholics. It has been

well said, that "Cardinal Newman helped to intellectually convert Englishmen, while Cardinal Manning helped to socially convert them." Both succeeded—in the fullest measure that was practicable. And, to go one step further back—for we must render justice to the long-dead—the three England-influencing cardinals of the nineteenth century have each admirably fulfilled the mission that was appointed to him. Cardinal Wiseman, braving the *odium theologicum*, the unreasoning Protestant hatred of the Catholic religion, succeeded in impressing Englishmen with this "new idea:" That the Catholic faith and a high intelligence might be compatible. But intellectual honesty is not the same thing with a high intelligence; and, while every one conceded to Wiseman splendid gifts, his friends alone were quite convinced of his ingenuousness. He was looked upon by English Protestants as a crafty emissary of a foreign power, whose main duty was to delude the English by fine scholarship. He stood the storm of the Protestant abuse with admirable calm. He published books, he edited plays, he lectured widely, he wrote to the newspapers; but he seemed to realize that his painful mission was to "prepare the way," not to reap, to taste the fruits, to enjoy the reward. Yet, without *his* mission, the cardinals who followed him might have been failures. When Monsignor Manning became the second Cardinal Archbishop, the English mind, so to speak, had been "led up to it." The red robe was now familiar and did not offend. A born Englishman, the son of a wealthy member of parliament, who had at one time been a Governor of the Bank of England, a public-school man, and an Oxford-class man, the intimate friend of Anglican dignitaries, and himself a quondam-archdeacon of Chichester, Dr. Manning became a sort of English realization of the foreign idea known before only as "Wiseman." It must be admitted, therefore, that he started on his new career with what may be called comparatively high advantages. Yet no one suspected what the *future* Manning would become when age should ripen his knowledge and experience. It was thought that he would be a dignified ecclesiastic; possibly, a favorite with the upper classes, or even at Court; but was it imagined that he would become a great social reformer; that he would completely change the hostile attitude of society towards the Catholic Church and towards Catholics; that he would accomplish what no English Catholic had yet looked for—the conversion of the Protestant mind to the calm assurance of Catholic loyalty in all political, social, commercial, and ethical grooves; that he would die having made his countrymen believe in Catholics, though they might not, perhaps, wholly believe in the Catholic religion? No such future was confidently predicted for "Monsignor Manning." He was supposed only to be a "first-

rate second-rate man." He turned out to be the most useful Catholic of his century.

Yet he was aided, profoundly aided, in his achievement by the side-by-side mission of John Henry Newman. There were two "new views" which Dr. Newman had taught his countrymen a dozen years before Monsignor Manning was made cardinal; the one, that the Catholic religion might be intellectually "not un-English," and the other that it might be, morally, ingenuous. Yet there still remained the inheritance of three centuries of prejudice, which has poisoned the life-blood of English *social* first principles; perhaps even the "social" more than the "religious" first principles, as every one who knows the English character can understand. John Bull is an islander, spite of his boast of world-wideness; nor can he wholly throw off his painfully social insularity. He has immensely widened himself in the last thirty years by travel, and by the observation of the habits of foreigners in his own country; still, he is an Englishman first, and a cosmopolitan afterwards, if indeed he ever becomes a citizen of the world. Now this social failing has made him dull to Catholic appeal. He is quite as religious, perhaps, as are other people in his disposition; yet the religion which he professes must be English, for otherwise it cannot possibly be the right thing. Cardinal Manning taught him that the Catholic religion was English. And how he taught it, we may profitably consider for a few moments.

"Let it be granted"—such had been the postulate of English Protestantism between the years 1600-1840—"that the Catholic religion is not only inimical to God's truth but is fatal to loyalty, to honesty, to sincerity, to all social and domestic security and peace." The Catholic religion was therefore, postulately, un-English! And to prove a postulate to be an absurdity is a much more difficult task than to prove the falsity of an inference from a given premise. Indeed, a fact is the only vanquisher of a false postulate. Such a fact was forthcoming some forty years ago in the conversion to the Catholic religion of such highly reputed Englishmen as Frederick Faber, Ambrose de Lisle, Archdeacon Wilberforce, Mr. Spencer, Mr. Hope Scott, Mr. Coleridge, Mr. Oakley, Mr. Allies, and many others; not to single out that "Anglican conversione," John Henry Newman, or that "Xavier of the Church of England," Archdeacon Manning. Still, we had not seen the "working out" of this hard fact, until time showed whether all the converts were not mistaken. "Place one of these distinguished converts in a high position," we might imagine the old-fashioned Protestant to have said: "Where he can do himself and his religion full justice, and let us then see whether the Protestant postulate will not be justified." So Archdeacon Manning mounted the throne of an arch-

bishop. A quarter of a century was the trying term of his probation. And in that term he did five things all well, all successfully, which dethroned the Protestant postulate; indeed, killed it.

Let us briefly enumerate these five successes:

1. Politically, Cardinal Manning united Irish and English Catholics in a bond of brotherhood that did not exist before his time. He was known to be a Home Ruler; yet, apart from this conviction, he worked for harmony between two races which, by "historic accidents," had become unhappily divided; and worked so well, that whereas, in the days of Cardinal Wiseman, an Irishman was as much of a foreigner as a Frenchman, there is now positively no discord nor estrangement. This of itself was no mean political service. But now to speak of his political influence with the British government. Political influence is not to be gauged by what is read or what is printed; it is a secret and a quietly permeating force; and not a few members of two ministries have let it be known among their acquaintance with what respect they had weighed the cardinal's wise counsel. Nor is it easy to draw the line between the highest social influence and such influence as is commonly called political. For example, if the cardinal could impress the government with the wisdom of his own views on both Catholic and denominational education, on the whole programme of social reform, on the legitimate organization of labor, on the duties of the State to the impoverished classes, and, above all, on the political justice due to Ireland, it is obvious that such influence, though indirect, was political; and, as a matter of fact, it was so accepted. Or again, if to the *Times* newspaper the cardinal could write lucidly, and very frequently, upon many a branch of political economy; always bravely battling for the side of the working classes, yet at the same time distinguishing broadly between such claims as were industrial, and a fictitious and also unjust modern socialism; it is obvious that such influence was didactic and operative, and therefore in real sense political. And once more, though the root of the matter is perhaps social, still its effects or its consequences are semi-political; if the Cardinal could bring it about that it is now recognized as an acquired right that Catholic priests shall take their place on boards of guardians, on Mansion House Committees, and on all occasions where public interests are concerned, we may argue that, forasmuch as before the Cardinal's days, no such rights were ever conceded nor even demanded, we have to thank the Cardinal for such new privileges as are quasi-political, for such social powers as trench closely on the administrative.

2. More easy is it to show that the cardinal's purely social successes have been remarkable both for their breadth and their vitality. To have succeeded in reconciling English Protestants to

this hypothesis: that the highest Catholic ecclesiastic in the realm might be also the leading English philanthropist, the most potent of the friends of the industrial classes, the ablest patron of distinctively English institutions, and the most practical of the reformers of the intemperate, was a huge conquest over prejudice, which might have seemed impracticable to born Catholics, but which has been quietly achieved by "one of the converts." And what the cardinal gained for himself he gained for others. All Englishmen are now accustomed to read of Catholic bishops and Catholic priests "taking the chair" at festal gatherings or celebrations; nor is there any protest against the favors or even the preferences which are shown by official persons to known Catholics. Finally, in the ordinary social or domestic life Catholics are as welcome in drawing-rooms as are non-Catholics; in the London clubs there is no prejudice, no inquiry; in the city, or in public offices, the subject is never pressed—save, indeed, by an exceptionally narrow-minded few; while among the Anglican clergy there is not any apparent predisposition to avoid a man because he has "turned Catholic." To whom do English Catholics owe these changes? Not, of course, to any one man by himself. They could no more be ascribed to an individual than to a religious order; to a cardinal or a priest than to a distinguished layman. They are the result of the gradual reforming of the social spirit. Yet, perhaps, we may say this much confidently: that Cardinal Manning, more than any man, taught the upper and the middle classes that the Christian religion must be firmly based upon natural religion; and that the first principle of natural religion being universal kindliness, the Catholic religion necessarily carries that principle to perfection. It was this conviction, deeply implanted by Cardinal Manning (of whom it was well said by a dissenting minister, "the Cardinal's politics are those of his Divine Master, for they begin with the universal brotherhood of mankind, and make the loving our neighbor as ourself to be the only real proof that we love God"), which made Englishmen to look admiringly upon this *social* side of Catholicity, and so to open their hearts, as well as their doors, to active Catholics. For the English people of all classes having a deep respect for real beneficence, esteeming charity, in all its phases, as divinely virtuous, and giving their warmest homage to those who are proved to be the "friends of man," naturally *believed* in Cardinal Manning, who let it be known to all the world that "natural religion was born of the Eternal Father." May it be said that because the Cardinal *began* with natural religion; insisting, that unless a man obliged his natural conscience he would not be worthy to receive the supernatural enlightenment; the English people respected that "sound common sense" which did not talk

about flying before you can walk. The Cardinal was believed in because he was "a man"; not a speculative spiritual theorist who taught in the clouds, or preached a religion which was a delicate spiritual exotic; but who maintained that the highest grace of nature was unselfishness, and that Christianity is really the perfecting of that grace.

3. It would take a volume to describe what the Cardinal did for education. There would be three grooves in which he could work for education: (1) among the poor; (2) among the middle classes and (3) among the clergy. His own education, begun at Harrow, continued at Baliol college, Oxford, whence he graduated in first-class classical honors; and it may be said, too, matured in that after-atmosphere of educatedness in which he lived for many years as an Anglican dignitary, enriched him with that "man of the world" kind of knowledge which enabled him to cope with every antagonist. And first, as to the education of the poorer classes, we may quote the words of Sir H. Francis Sandford, addressed on the recent "Jubilee Day" to His Eminence: "I feel from my heart that if England is to remain a Christian country, so far as education is concerned, the happy result will be largely due to Your Eminence." How shall we put together in few words the vast results? Thus: of thousands of Catholic children rescued from the gutters; schools, orphanages, homes, reared for them in all parts of the country; forty-nine new departments in elementary schools, with an increase in the daily attendance of many thousands; and so great a peace and discipline reigning among these schools that a London newspaper has asked in a leading article, "What is the subtle charm of Roman Catholicism that it can make the lowest classes of children look so refined?" Such has been a fraction of that Catholic school-work which has built up a new Catholic generation. And if we say a word, too, of the middle or the upper-class education, it is manifest that we must associate it with that increase in Catholic seminaries which has created so many perfectly new opportunities. Indeed, the education of the students for the priesthood must come closely into connection with this subject; so much so that we may speak of the clerical and of the higher lay education as being necessarily sympathetic and inter-auxiliary. Now, it is quite remarkable what a number of new theological seminaries have sprung up under Cardinal Manning's initiation. The admirable St. Thomas' Seminary, from which about two hundred priests have already issued, cost English Catholics about two hundred thousand dollars; while about forty students are in residence at the new College of St. Nicholas; and as to the new religious communities for men, there are forty-nine, most of which aid in some degree educationally; the Sisters, too, of the active orders

contributing their daily service to the education of the younger feminine generation. There is no need to add more upon this subject than that the advance of Catholic education in England has been parallel with the advance of the Catholic religion. And on this last point—though we will speak of the Cardinal's work only—it may suffice to mention these few facts:

(4.) Forty-five new Catholic churches in the Westminster diocese, besides a generous sprinkling of small missions, have been founded and completed within thirty years; (2) ten thousand additional Catholic children attend the schools; (3) two thousand orphans are housed and religiously tended; (4) the number of Easter communicants has advanced within the same period from fifty-three to eighty-five thousand.

Lastly (5), one word must be added on the League of the Cross, founded by the severely ascetical Cardinal Manning. There is probably no country in which the temptations to inebriety are so gross and so numerous as they are in England; gross, because of the vile nature of the stimulants, and numerous in regard to the ubiquity of the public houses. About one-half of the members of the House of Lords own fifteen hundred public houses between them, from which fact may be inferred the popularity of such kind of property among the classes who have idle capital for investment. More than two-thirds of the crime in Great Britain is fathered by this "prince of sources of the revenue," so that, as a member of the House of Commons once observed, "the great public institutions of this country are largely maintained by inciting to vice." Now, Cardinal Manning was not the first to see the truth, that a national evil must be met by a national sacrifice; yet he was one of the first to impress this principle on English society: "The best way to stop a poisonous growth is to pluck out the roots." He therefore heroically advocated a self-denial by *all* persons as the best way of discouraging indulgence by *many* persons. The principle has been argued for and against; nor need we now speak of it save only in one bearing, and that bearing is the proved, practical results. Thousands of Catholic families have been saved, domestically, by total abstinence; while, as to the country generally, the noble example has been followed, and scores of public houses have closed their doors. Thus, at the cost of a considerable amount of personal enjoyment,—of perfectly legitimate and often salutary enjoyment,—the example set by the Cardinal has been followed by vast numbers, who, not being at all disposed themselves to intemperance, have made a real sacrifice to save others.

II.

Thus far we have glanced at the career of Cardinal Manning in its relation to the outer word,—to whole communities. Let us

now think of him in spheres which were more circumscribed, or which were narrowed by purely Catholic sympathies. As a writer, an author, the Cardinal held a front rank, from the ease and perspicuity of his composition. In this respect he was not unlike Cardinal Newman, though doubtless he had more of the simplicity of Addison than of the depth and power of the great oratorian. His English was pure and perfect, equally in writing and in speaking. And it had always the stillness of maturity. In such books as "*The Internal Mission of the Holy Ghost*," or "*The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost*," we are pleased with a quiet sincerity and a masterly knowledge, though seldom surprised by inventiveness or brilliancy. It has been said of the Cardinal that he controlled himself so thoroughly that he even suppressed his own power, his superiority; and certainly they who were his friends would always allow that self-control was his dominant characteristic through life. In writing a book, he seemed to set before him a duty, and no other object than duty was allowed to plead with him. In his "*True Story of the Vatican Council*," this sense of duty speaks from the pages, so that the reader feels that the whole story must be true, not so much because all false reports are refuted, as because the writer impresses his truthfulness irresistibly. Take, again, that masterly little book, "*The Grounds of Faith*." There is a quietness about it which is the quietness of calm assurance, every sentence "going home" to the reader's conscience as though it were the counsel of an earnest soul to his inmost friend. The pithiness, too, of the summing up of any controversy is often so neat as to be striking; it reminds us not unfrequently of Cardinal Newman. For example, he is speaking of the Anglican "*Branch Theory*," and he says: "These three bodies, so united in unwilling espousals, divorce each other. The Greek will not accept the Anglican with his mutilation of sacraments; nor will the Anglican accept the Greek with his practice of innovation. Neither does the Holy See accept either with their heresy and their schism. These three bodies, brought by theory into unwilling combination, refuse, in fact, to be combined. They can be united only upon paper." And the same neatness—very frequently quite epigrammatic—is found in everything that the Cardinal puts his hand to. No to speak of any of his Pastorals,—all admirable as compositions,—take his "*Four Great Evils of the Day*," his "*Fourfold Sovereignty of God*," his "*Cæsarism and Ultramontanism*," his "*Eternal Priesthood*," these productions all bear the same marked characteristics,—pithiness, perfect conviction, sense of duty. And when he wrote, as he frequently did, in periodicals, responding to many of the false cries of modern thought, the impression was, "the writer knows he is in the right, and only writes because he knows it."

As to the Cardinal's preaching, opinions differed. That he was perfectly easy, perfectly scholarly, all allowed; yet some people would have liked less self-suppression. He seemed to think that all emotionalism was out of place. He would talk as quietly from the sanctuary as he would talk with friends, shunning rhetoric, artifice, warm effect, just as in his books or in his published letters he was quite natural. Hence, many persons would not allow that he was a great preacher. Yet the one conviction of all who heard him was, "that is true"; the one resolve of all who listened was, "I will do it." So that since he persuaded—which is the sovereign test of all true oratory—he must have been a good preacher, if not a great one. They who have listened to some of the select preachers at Nôtre Dame, in Paris, or to the glorious earnestness of other impassioned preachers in the south, will perhaps allow that they were more captivated by the brilliancy than they were braced up to newness by the truth. Now, Cardinal Manning had little method, little style. What pleaded with you when he was preaching, so far as "the man" was allowed to plead, was his most picturesque asceticism, his holy look.

And one trait which was in perfect keeping with such characteristics was his immense charity, in believing the best of all non-Catholics. He would say of his Protestant countrymen, "They are not heretics, they are in heresy." Only a few weeks before he died, he published a letter, which, unhappily, was not quite taken as it was meant. He wrote that all good and sincere Protestants must be charitably hoped to belong to the spiritual body of the Church; a hope which was, at once, magnanimous and well grounded, but which left immense margin to the interpretation of "sincerity." Yet, here we had the gentle spirit of this saintly man. In his old age he seemed to lose every other feeling than the tranquil desire to believe and to do kindly. Ripe with the ripeness of eighty-four years; worn out by having worked hard for others' good; looking forward to the eternal home above where shall be no rancor, no false judgment; the last years of the good Cardinal were like the maturity of Christian virtues, from which all soil, dross, or earthliness had dropped away.

In private life there was always that grave playfulness which made him singularly winning and even fascinating. His keen sense of humor was subjected to the same mastership which ruled absolutely every action and every word; yet he had a quiet way of giving gentle monitions which, though it never offended, left its mark. Thus, to a Cambridge undergraduate, who told him that he had the intention of taking Holy Orders, he replied, "Be sure that you get them, my son." To a young lady of nineteen, who promised him to become a Catholic so soon as she should attain the age of

twenty-one, he replied, "Can you promise me that you will live till you are twenty-one?" His quiet and exact way of pointing a retort, enlivened only by a gentle humor, which was like light, made even his monitions to be fascinating, while it made his exhortations inspiring. And at this point it may be mentioned—since we are speaking chiefly of his private career—that his private charities were quite as princely as his public services, his private kindnesses as superlative as was his philanthropy. No wonder that he left so little behind him. It seemed incredible that out of his really narrow resources he could positively never send a poor pleader away from him without a help, which was as substantial in character as it was graceful in the manner of its imparting.

Nor will it be idle to mention here that he was fondly interested in children, and was a constant helper of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty. It was through the Cardinal that the Queen became patron of this society. Mr. Stead, the well known Protestant journalist, recently wrote: "Many have been the speculations as to the figure which the Cardinal will make in history. Some have pictured him as the tribune of the poor, others as an incipient Hildebrand, others as a nineteenth-century Loyola; but, I prefer to think of him as the loving-hearted old man who, when his heart is filled with ecstasy after a meditation on the life and love of our Lord, feels impelled to go forth among the crowds of children playing in the London parks, and to silently bless them in the name of Him who said, 'Suffer little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not.'"

III.

Let us take up Mr. Stead's words, in conclusion, and ask, "What will be the figure which the Cardinal will make in history?"

Now the Irish, with one accord, will claim for the Cardinal the historic figure of the most generous of the English champions of Irish liberties. In the words of the resolution of the Irish Parliamentary party, assembled in London on the 18th of January: "His memory will be cherished by the people of Ireland, with reverence and love, for his earnest and persevering efforts to obtain the application of the golden rule of Christian conduct to the treatment of their national claims for justice." It is perfectly true that the Cardinal took no public or professed part in the political struggle for the restoration of Irish liberties, but he never lost an opportunity of letting the whole world know his sentiments on the vexed question which is summed up in Home Rule. In the words of his letter addressed to Mr. Munich, now a little more than seven years ago, he "always held himself to be officially bound to neutrality on party questions; but the restoration of Ireland's legisla-

tive rights he regarded as a matter of national restitution, and altogether beyond partisan considerations." And this attitude of bold, unflinching advocacy of Ireland's rights—maintained both in public and in private—was all the more chivalrous in the face of the painful fact that the majority of Catholic aristocrats were anti-Irish. This majority also set the bad fashion for the Catholic middle classes who talk of Ireland as if it were some barbarous country which had never possessed Christian liberties; whereas, they should know that Ireland preceded England by a long era of civilization, and owes all the evils of her modern history to English barbarism. Now, the Irish in England keenly appreciated the warm advocacy of the English-born champion of their rights. And there was, too, a deeper than a political feeling in the tenderness of their appreciation of this sympathy. They knew that English Catholics owed their enjoyment of religious liberty very largely to the superb fidelity of the Irish—they knew, moreover, that a fearful debt was owed to Irishmen by Englishmen for the satanic cruelties with which English government had tortured them; and they knew how *they*, the Irish, would have leaped at reparation had the national interest been historically reversed. This strange ingratitude or insensibility, on the part of many English Catholics, caused terrible sadness of soul to their Irish neighbors; and therefore was it, that they gave to Cardinal Manning the full swing of their souls' tender thankfulness; and therefore, also, will Irish historians in days to come give to Cardinal Manning the historic figure of Ireland's Friend—the friend of the Irish people, of their religion, of their rights.

But what figure will English historians give to Cardinal Manning, in regard to his relations to English society? Undoubtedly, as was said at the beginning of this article, the weakening of the social prejudice against the status of Catholics,—their religious, political, and social status,—has been the most conspicuous of the triumphs of the late Cardinal; so that his historical figure will probably be that of the Englishman who killed prejudice, more than any Englishman since the Reformation. Take one really eloquent illustration: For many years it has been a habit of members of the royal family to assist at Catholic celebrations in Catholic churches. At the Cardinal's Requiem representatives of the royal family were present officially and demonstratively; they assisted at Mass; they showed by their reverent manner that they profoundly honored the Cardinal's religion, even more profoundly than they venerated his memory. We may say, therefore, that the official recognition of Catholicity, as a faith which has equal claims with the Church-of-Englandism, is a perfectly new feature in the last twenty years. And may it be added (for this is conso-

nant with our inquiry), that the new Anglican custom of holding memorial services, for those who die outside the pale of the Catholic Church, is a tribute to the reasonable justice and blessed charity of the Catholic custom of saying prayers for the dead. It is a very close approach to Catholic sentiment, though hitherto it has stopped short of Catholic doctrine. Yet the doctrine is profoundly honored by the sentiment. Indeed, these memorial services, of which Queen Victoria is the grand patron, was a touchingly beautiful tribute to the Catholic faith; they show how natural is the instinct of the communion between two worlds, and they promise an easy transition to the whole truth. Now the future historian or essayist, when he comes to speak of Cardinal Manning, will have to say that the tone and temper of religious thought was rationally affected by the close proximity of the Catholic faith. We can imagine an historian writing fifty years hence: "In those days there was a Protestant craving for something better. Even the excesses of the Ritualists showed the longing for a something wanting; while the assumption of a mild pontificate by Archbishop Benson proved the instinct of the necessity for a sovereign rule." And then we can imagine the historian adding: "the frightful inroads of impious freethinking in Protestant England were alarming to all good Protestants as to what was to come; while at the same time these good Protestants watched the resistance of the Catholic Church to the rush of the wild waters of unbelief." And just at this point—to anticipate the climax of our future essayist—we can imagine him thus warming in his eulogy: "Cardinal Manning was the typical figure of that moral force which all England saw could alone resist freethinking; in his person was seen the figure of Catholic resistance; his was associated in the English mind with the idea, authority; he was regarded even as alone embodying the positive, while all around him seemed to be negative or at least speculative; and so he was looked upon as a true friend to the country, and when he died, he was mourned as an apostle."

Finally, what do the English working classes say of the Cardinal; what "figure" do they prophesy for him in history? Irish, English, and Italian workers in the great towns all testify that "in the death of the Cardinal they have lost their best friend and advocate." All remember especially how, during the great Dock strike, when scores of thousands of London workmen were in danger of starving, the Cardinal met the united strike committees at an appointed place, and pleaded so earnestly with them, point by point, through all their difficulties, that his counsel put an end to the terrible crisis. All remember too his wonderful letters on the Social Question, on the Poor Jews, on the Temperance Ques-

tion, on Religious Music, on the Problem of the Unemployed, on millions of our brothers who groan under the yoke of Excessive Labor, on the Right to Work for Food, on the Eight Hour Day, on Want in Winter, on the Omnibus Men, on Homes for the Working Boys and Clubs for the Working Girls, on the London Music Halls, on My Old and Tried Sympathy with Ireland—of which near country he said in a public oration, when he was pleading for English justice to the Irish: “A narrow channel only divides us from a people who speak the same tongue, who are of the same family with us, who are our fellow countrymen, who are our brothers.” And, finally, all remember the splendid stand which he made, by almost innumerable letters and pamphlets, for the right of poor Catholic parents to have their children educated in the faith which was to them more than home, more than life; and, as a consequence, all now know the fact, that the School Boards of England no longer ignore Christianity, while there is not so much as one Metropolitan Union which does not send its Catholic children to Catholic teachers.

The special point then of all these pleadings,—what we may call their doctrine of social philosophy,—was that all classes had the same right to religious justice, and all classes had the same right to temporal benefits; that the workman was fully as honorable as his employer, had the same claim on our respect and consideration, was as much a member, in a Catholic sense, of the family of God, as the sovereign, the noble, the capitalist. We know, indeed, that this is a Catholic truism, but it is a truism which had been long ignored in English society. Cardinal Manning brought it to life and gave it power. He may be said even to have made it a grand political axiom. Whereas, when he was consecrated Archbishop of Westminster, the English workman had few rights, had only concessions, he has now,—to quote the words of the late Cardinal, published a few years ago to all England—“fully as honorable a position as his employer, and his rights are equally sacred and inviolable.”

“The Workman’s Friend” is therefore that figure in English history which the English workman can safely prophesy for his greatest benefactor; and if he could inscribe an epitaph over his grave, he might aptly use the Divine words, so often heard from the good Cardinal, “I have compassion on the multitude.”

ARTHUR F. MARSHALL.

CATHOLIC ASTRONOMERS.

ON the 7th of December, 1889, H. M. S. *Comus* reached the Iles de Salût, near Cayenne, having on board Rev. Stephen Joseph Perry, S. J., who had come to observe the solar eclipse of December 22, 1889. Owing to the poor sanitary arrangements of the island, rain causes an effluvium to rise from the soil, which is almost insupportable to visitors. During the days preceding the eclipse there was heavy rain, and Father Perry, already weakened from severe sea-sickness during the voyage from Barbados, was attacked by fever.

On the morning of the 22d the temporary observatory, in which all the necessary preparations for the successful observation of the eclipse had been made, presents a picture which will ever be associated with this eclipse: All the instruments are prepared and adjusted, and each observer is at his post when the director, Father Perry, attacked by a fatal fever, weak and suffering, enters, leaning on the arm of a blue-jacket. He comes to take his last observation, to perform the task which, in recognition of his merits, the Solar Eclipse Committee of the Royal Astronomical Society, has imposed upon him, to pay his last tribute of love to the science he loved so well, to die a martyr of science. A kind Providence will crown this his last work with success. Although a heavy rain fell shortly before the eclipse, still at the critical moment the sky brightened and the half-eclipsed sun appeared in a large patch of blue sky. The programme drawn up was faithfully carried out, and when the observations were finished, Father Perry was able to say: "This is the most successful observation of the kind that I have ever had anything to do with."

The affecting story of the few remaining days of his life has been often told. The painful journey from the camp back to his quarters at the Military Hospital, the devout reception of the last sacraments on board the *Comus* before they set sail, the dictation from his death-bed of the telegram which announced at Greenwich the results of his work, the resignation, the peaceful and holy death at sea, about seventy miles from Demerara, are all well known and part of the history of this eclipse.

Father Perry's chief work was done as director of the Stonyhurst observatory. It was in the line of terrestrial magnetism and solar physics. His papers on these subjects are valuable contributions to science. As a lecturer on astronomical subjects he was

especially successful. His great care in preparation, accurate and enthusiastic exposition, and power of adapting himself to his audience, made him popular, as the long list of places in which he lectured shows. He lectured at the Royal Institution before the Société Scientifique of Brussels, and the Catholic Scientific Congress at Paris, at Dublin, Cambridge, Montreal, South Kensington, Manchester, Wigan, Lancaster, Preston, Burnley, Glasgow, Blackpool, Skipton, Oldham, Bolton, Chester, Southampton, Birmingham, Bombay, Barbados and Georgetown, Demerara. He also lectured on board the vessels which conveyed him on his many astronomical expeditions, and everywhere met with the greatest success; and equally painstaking, whether he spoke to the small boys at Hodder, to the workingmen of Lancashire, or to the cultured audience at the Royal Institution. Besides his work in the class-room at Stonyhurst, his labor in the observatory and his numerous courses of lectures just enumerated, he found time to take part in several scientific expeditions. In fact, at the time of the last, it was said that he was a member of more scientific expeditions than any living astronomer. His first was in 1870, to Spain, to observe a solar eclipse, when he had charge of the station at Cadiz. In 1874, Sir G. B. Airy, then royal astronomer, appointed him to take command of the expedition to Kerguelen or Desolation Island in the South Pacific to observe the transit of Venus. The success with which he conducted his work on this journey and in the midst of great difficulties, caused him to be selected to lead another party in 1882 to Nos Vey, Madagascar, to observe the second transit of Venus of this century. In August, 1886, he was at Carriacou in the West Indies, and in August, 1887, he was in Russia, on both occasions on solar eclipse expeditions. To these must be added his last journey to Salût. Father Perry was enthusiastic in his astronomical work, but his enthusiasm was well regulated, and never interfered with thoroughness and patient accuracy. Hence, his published results can be trusted as deductions from a long and careful series of observations. Many of his principal papers on scientific subjects are to be found in the "Monthly Notices" of the Royal Astronomical Society, others in "The Month," "Nature," "Tablet," "Observatory," "Copernicus," "British Journal of Photography," "Astronomical Register," and "Annales de la Société Scientifique de Bruxelles," etc.

In a life so full of labor in the cause of science, and at the same time so remarkable for the faithful and loving discharge of the duties of his sacred calling as a priest and religious of the Society of Jesus, we have a strong argument that faith has nothing to fear from science and a refutation of the old calumny that the Church is opposed to science. In his life, science has been adorned by

labors carried on in the spirit of the Church, so well expressed in the fourth chapter of the constitution "*Dei Filius*:" "The Catholic Church with one consent has ever held and does hold that there is a twofold order of knowledge, distinct both in principle and also in object: in principle, because our knowledge in the one is by natural reason, and in the other by divine faith; in object, because besides those things to which natural reason can attain, there are proposed to our belief mysteries hidden in God, which, unless divinely revealed, cannot be known. . . . But, although faith is above reason, there can never be any real discrepancy between faith and reason, since the same God who reveals mysteries and infuses faith has bestowed the light of reason on the human mind, and God cannot deny Himself, nor truth ever contradict truth. . . . And not only can faith and reason never be opposed to one another, but they are of mutual aid one to the other; for right reason demonstrates the foundations of faith, and, enlightened by its light, cultivates the science of things divine; while faith frees and guards reason from errors and furnishes it with manifold knowledge. So far, therefore, is the Church from opposing the cultivation of human arts and sciences, that it in many ways helps and promotes it. For the Church neither ignores nor despises the benefits of human life which result from the arts and sciences, but confesses that, as they come from God, the Lord of all science, so, if they be rightly used, they lead to God by the help of His grace. Nor does the Church forbid that each of these sciences in its sphere should make use of its own principles and its own method; but recognizing this just liberty, it stands watchfully on guard, lest sciences, setting themselves against the divine teaching, or transgressing their own limits, should invade and disturb the domain of faith."

With such a plain statement of the position which the Church has ever held, and will ever continue to hold, with regard to science, it is almost incredible that men should find a theme in what they are pleased to call the conflict of the Church and science, and should almost continually portray, in glowing terms, what they are pleased to imagine is the fear and consternation of the Church at the sight of the prodigious development of modern science.

It is in this spirit that Huxley writes in his "*Lay Sermons*:" "Our great antagonist—I speak as a man of science—the Roman Catholic Church, the one great spiritual organization which is able to resist, and must, as a matter of life and death resist, the progress of science and modern civilization, manages her affairs much better." It is in the same strain that Tyndall writes in his article on "*Martineau and Materialism*." He says, speaking of Catholics: "Their spiritual guides live so exclusively in the pre-scientific past that even the really strong intellects among them are reduced to

atrophy as regards scientific truth. Eyes they have, and see not; ears they have, and hear not; for both eyes and ears are taken possession of by the sights and sounds of another age. In relation to science, the ultramontane brain, through lack of exercise, is virtually the undeveloped brain of the child."

That such statements are wide of the truth is clear, if we but recall the work of Father Perry. So far, indeed, is the Church from opposing science, that it was under her protection, and with her encouragement, and even with the pecuniary aid of her Pontiffs that some of the most remarkable scientists of modern times were enabled to carry on the investigations which have immortalized their names and enhanced the treasures of science.

There may be an apparent strife between science and religion; but this is due to the illogical method of drawing certain conclusions from hypothetical premises; a method, alas! too prevalent among a certain class of writers. They take the guess, or the trial hypothesis, of some investigator, and treat it as a fully-established truth from which they draw the most sweeping conclusions. A specimen will show what we mean. Professor Huxley writes, in the "Nineteenth Century," "You are quite mistaken in supposing that anybody, who is acquainted with the possibilities of physical science, will undertake to categorically deny that water may be turned into wine. Many very competent judges are already inclined to think that the bodies, which we have hitherto called elementary, are really composite arrangements of the particles of a uniform primitive matter. Supposing that view to be correct, there would be no more theoretical difficulty about turning water into alcohol, ethereal and coloring matters, than there is at this present moment any practical difficulty in working other such miracles; as, when we turn sugar into alcohol, carbonic acid, glycerine, and succinic acid; or, transmute gas-refuse into perfumes rarer than musk, and dyes richer than Tyrian purple." Mr. Lockyer has proposed an unestablished theory of the dissociation of the elements to explain solar phenomena, and therefore, according to Mr. Huxley, our Lord did not perform a miracle at the marriage feast. The conclusion is not warranted by the premise, and, even if the premise were an established truth, the conclusion is too sweeping. For our divine Lord spoke but the word and the miraculous change took place. Mr. Huxley might easily make a fortune if he could perform what he calls "other such miracles," "transmute gas-refuse into perfumes rarer than musk, and dyes richer than Tyrian purple," by simply talking at the contents of his retorts.

Our object, however, at present, is not so much to point out the illogical methods of reasoning adopted by the opponents of

the Church, as to show that the history of science is a perpetual refutation of the hue-and-cry which they have set up of the opposition of the Church to science. The long list of her faithful sons who are honored for their labor in every branch of science, is a forcible rebuke to those who have eyes to see and will not see, ears to hear and will not hear.

The task would be an unending one, did we undertake to give but the briefest sketch of Catholics eminent in all departments of science. So we will confine ourselves to those who have illustrated the science of astronomy; and here we are constrained to mention only some of the more prominent, merely to show that history proves our point.

Here, two errors must be guarded against. We do not claim that, because they were Catholics they were great astronomers, but simply point out the fact that their Catholicity did not forbid or impede them in their scientific studies; secondly, we do not wish to be understood as praising them to the disparagement of those distinguished astronomers who did not share their faith, but whose names are inseparably linked with the greatest achievements of the science of the heavens. To extol the genius of Galileo is not to detract from that of Newton; to praise Copernicus is not to dispraise Kepler. Far be it from us to disparage the work of Kepler, when our brothers in religion, the Jesuits of Gratz, gave him their protection and a safe asylum when he fled for his life from Protestant Tübingen. It would, indeed, be invidious to select any class of these able scientists and praise their labors to the disparagement of the others, who are entitled to at least an equal share in the honor of developing astronomy to its present perfect condition. Still, we may be pardoned if, for a special object, we select some among them, and show that they made their impress on the science of astronomy, and wrote their names indelibly in its history.

There have been numerous devotees of science, of all shades of belief, who have devoted themselves to science for the sake of science, and who have not sought to invade with imperfect equipment the domain of theology. In no science, perhaps, can this be said with as equal truth as in astronomy. All honor to these workers in their proper sphere, and we hail every new fact discovered, every new law elaborated, and every new confirmation of existing theories, giving to each its due weight, and to each discoverer the glory of his work.

It is without offence to these that we select a few Catholic astronomers, and point out their share in the development of the science, in order to add a refutation to those who still affirm that Catholics shun the scientific field on account of what they are pleased to call the conflict of science and religion. They claim

that science threatens the foundations of Christianity, and hence Catholics shun it. The calumny, we know, is threadbare, but still, every now and then, it is brushed up like second-hand stock and exhibited in the hope that appearances may deceive.

The first period in astronomy was, as in all science, one of observation. The time of return of the heavenly bodies was carefully calculated, and their places in space determined. This was the work of the Chinese and Chaldeans, to which the Greeks added a complex geometrical plan of cycles and epicycles in explanation of these motions. Thus was the way prepared for the simple and harmonious system of Copernicus. This discoverer of the true mechanism of the heavens was born on the 19th of February, 1473, at Thorn, in West Prussia. Educated at the University of Cracow, at the age of 25 he went to Rome to perfect himself in astronomy, and became the pupil of Regiomontanus, who was, at that time, the most celebrated astronomer of the world. He received Holy Orders while in Rome, and, on returning to his own country, was made Canon of the Church of Frauenburg. Forty years of labor in the garret of a farm-house, with instruments of the rudest workmanship, without the telescope, and without the knowledge of the law of gravitation, was crowned by the establishment of his grand hypothesis. Late in life though, and at the instigation of Cardinal Schomberg, he published his great work, "*De Revolutionibus Orbium Cœlestium*," which he dedicated to Pope Paul III. According to the old system, the earth was the immovable centre of the heavens, and around this centre the heavens revolved once in twenty-four hours. To account for the retrograde motion of the planets, this system was encumbered with the complicated machinery of cycles and epicycles. The planets moved in circles around assumed centres, which were themselves moving in circular orbits around the Earth. Such complexity was, in the mind of Copernicus, inconsistent with the simplicity and grandeur which he saw in the works of the Creator. The theory he proposed was, fundamentally, first, that the Earth makes a complete revolution on its axis once in twenty-four hours, thus occasioning the apparent diurnal revolution of the heavens; and, secondly, that the Sun and not the Earth is the centre around which the earth and all the other planets revolve. His determination of the relative distances of the planets from the sun differs but little from that made by more approved methods. Considering the primitive means of observation at his disposal, it is remarkable to find such accuracy in his results.

He divided his day into three parts; the first he devoted to the duties of his sacred calling; the second, to the care of the poor; and the third to scientific study. He loved science, but did

not neglect his sacred office. And to this Catholic priest we owe the foundation on which succeeding generations have reared the grand structure of modern astronomy.

Thus closed the first era of astronomical development; the second, or theoretical, was begotten of the spirit of inquiry which was gradually developing, and seeking the causes of the numerous facts collected during the preceding or observational era. The second period began with the annunciation of the theory of universal gravitation. On its threshold we meet Galileo. "What were the laws made use of by Newton," asks Herbert Spencer, "in working out his grand discovery? The law of falling bodies, disclosed by Galileo; that of the composition of forces, also disclosed by Galileo; and that of centrifugal force, found out by Huyghens—all of them generalizations of terrestrial physics." Thus Galileo claims a share in the establishment of universal gravitation, which began the second great period of development in astronomy, and which is marked by elaborate calculus that unravels the intricate consequences of a single simple law. Some claim Galileo as the inventor of the telescope, but, though this claim does not seem well-founded, still, it is certain that he made his own, and was the first to direct a telescope towards the heavens. He first saw the moon, with her mountains and valleys; Jupiter with his four satellites; Saturn, with his rings; Venus, with her moonlike phases; the milky-way, as a galaxy of fixed stars; and that the planets shone not with their own but with reflected light. These discoveries, by means of the telescope, have been so admired by the public that they have lost sight of his work in other fields which, perhaps, form the crowning merit of Galileo.

That Galileo lived and died a sincere Catholic is certain. His manner of upholding his observations brought him into trouble with the Roman tribunals, but his doctrine was never condemned as heretical, as the authors and propagators of a now threadbare calumny would have us believe. Whewell, in his "*Inductive Sciences*," speaking of the memoirs "*Galileo e l'Inquisizione*," by Mgr. Marino Marini, says "In these he confirms the conclusion which, I think, almost all persons who have studied the facts have arrived at, that Galileo trifled with authority to which he professed to submit, and was punished for obstinate contumacy, not for heresy." In a note, Whewell adds that Marini mentions Leibnitz, Guizot, Spittler, Eichorn, Raumer, Ranke among those who have at last done justice to the Church, hence there is no need of our entering upon this trite discussion. Suffice it to say Galileo died a sincere Catholic.

At the dawn of this second period we find Jean Picard, a French ecclesiastic, who was one of the original members and the first

president of the Academy of Sciences at Paris. His greatest service for astronomy was to make the first accurate measurement of a degree of the meridian. It was the measure of Picard that enabled Newton to establish the great principle of universal gravitation. He was the first to draw the attention of astronomers to the phenomena of nutation and aberration.

Throughout this period the names of Catholic astronomers are found in every department of the science. The first to bring the erratic comet within the reach of science was the Abbot Gassendi. He was also the first to observe the transit of a planet across the disc of the sun by projecting an image of the sun on a screen in a dark room, and thus noting the beginning and end of transit. In the study of comets, Father De Vico, S. J., is justly celebrated. He calculated the time of return of Halley's comet, and was the first to see it on August 5, 1835. He was the discoverer of eight comets.

The first great standard catalogue of stars was prepared by Piazzi, a Theatine monk, and this catalogue of 7646 stars has been the basis of all star catalogues since published. He corrected the parallaxes of some of the heavenly bodies, and the obliquity of the ecliptic. His untiring industry was shown in the systematic labor which resulted in the discovery of Ceres, the first known of the asteroids. He undertook to examine all the stars in a belt of the heavens bordering on the ecliptic. He examined them in groups of fifty, each group being subjected to four successive examinations before proceeding to the next. The thirteenth star in the 159th group was found to be a small planet or asteroid.

Among our Catholic astronomers we have Domenico Cassini, who calculated the periods of rotation of the sun, Venus, Mars, and Jupiter. He published very accurate tables of the sun in 1656. He also discovered the first, second, third and fifth satellites of Saturn. He was regarded as the most renowned astronomer of his day.

This list might be increased by the names of Miraldi, Castelli and Bianchini, and others who did efficient work in this their chosen field. Nor can we omit a reference to that grand and useful work, the revision of the calendar, for which we are indebted to Pope Gregory XIII., with whose name are associated those of Clavius, Chacon and Danti, to whom the Pope entrusted the work.

The sixteenth century was remarkable for the change that occurred in the spirit of progress. The studios of the sculptor and painter were deserted for the lecture-room of the scientist, and, as Libri remarks, the death of Michael Angelo and the birth of Galileo occurring on the same day, might be taken as a parable of the age. At first, science was studied in the proper spirit, but gradually there

grew up among some scientists a spirit of skepticism and materialism. To counteract this evil tendency, the Society of Jesus, in its schools, paid special attention to the study of science. Although the work of its members was not confined to any special branch, still they seem to have shown a special predilection for astronomy, and the great number of its members who devoted themselves to this study swells the list of Catholic astronomers. We quote from M. l'Abbe Maynard, "The Jesuits: their Studies and their Teaching."

"In Germany and the neighboring countries there were few Jesuit colleges without an observatory. They were found at Ingolstadt, Gratz, Breslau, Olmutz, Prague, Posen, etc. Most of them seem to have shared the fate of the society, though there are a few, as that of Prague, which survive the general destruction. The observatory of Prague, built in 1749, was, for a long time, under the care of Father Stepling, to whom the university principally owes the introduction of the exact sciences in her course of studies. In their magnificent college at Lyons, the Jesuits possessed an observatory most eligibly situated, which had been erected by Father de Saint-Bonnet. To him succeeded Father Rabuel, the erudite commentator on the geometry of Descartes; Duclos; and, finally, Father Béraud, an ingenious philosopher, an excellent geometer, a zealous and laborious observer. 'It affords me sincere pleasure,' continues Montucla, 'to cast some flowers of remembrance on the tomb of this worthy and learned Jesuit. He it was who initiated me in the science, and the same service was performed by him for citizens Bossut and Lalande.' To the Jesuits we owe the multiplication of observatories in various parts of Europe. Hitherto, they were scarcely to be found in the capitals; but the Jesuits spared neither pains nor expense to erect in every considerable college a building consecrated to astronomy. Thus, Father Huberti superintended the building of an observatory at Würzburg; Father Hell, at Vienna. At Manheim a third was founded by Charles Theodore, Elector of Bavaria, at the instance of Mayer and Metzger, and under their direction. Like establishments were erected at Tyrman, by Keri; at Prague, by Stepling, as Montucla has just informed us; at Gratz, by the Jesuits of the college; at Wilna, by Lebrowski and Poczobut; at Milan, by Pallavicini, after the designs of Boscovich, and at the expense of the society; at Florence, by Ximénès; at Parma, by Belgrado; at Venice, by Panigai; at Brescia, by Cavalli; at Rome, by Asclepi; at Lisbon, by Carboni and Copasse; at Marseilles, by Laval and Pezenas; and by Bonfa, at Avignon."

In the history of theoretical astronomy one of the most remarkable achievements of this branch must be accredited to the Catholic Leverrier. Arago proposed the task to Leverrier, then a

young astronomer who had distinguished himself by constructing a new set of tables from which the places of Mercury might be predicted with greater precision than by older tables. This was put to the test during the transit of Mercury on the 8th of May, 1845; and it was found that while the old tables were out fully one minute and a half, those of Leverrier were in error only by about sixteen seconds as a mean. The success of this investigation encouraged him to undertake the task proposed by Arago of solving the problem presented in the perturbations of Uranus. After the discovery of this planet, astronomers soon determined an orbit for it. It was found, however, that this planet did not follow this orbit, even after the orbit had been corrected in the light of new and repeated observations. Various suppositions had been made to explain the erratic conduct of Uranus when Leverrier attacked the problem. He determined to rely solely on his own efforts; he rejected all that had been done, and commenced the problem at the very beginning. New analytic theories were formed, elaborate investigations of Jupiter and Saturn as disturbing bodies were made, and all possible causes of disturbance in the known bodies of the system were carefully weighed, and the indefatigable mathematician could say, here are residual perturbations which cannot be accounted for by any known existing body; the explanation must be sought beyond Uranus. On June 1, 1846, he read before the Royal Academy of Sciences in Paris a memoir in which he proved that the perturbations of Uranus could be explained only by admitting the existence of a new planet exterior to Uranus. He set himself to work to calculate the position and mass of this unknown planet. It is impossible to convey in popular form an idea of the profound reasoning required for this investigation. Uranus was displaced by an amount only about equal to four times the apparent diameter of Jupiter as seen with the naked eye. No eye, however keen and piercing, without telescopic aid could ever have detected it. Yet Leverrier felt space for the cause of this disturbance, and so successfully, that on August 31, 1846, he was able to announce to the world the figure of the orbit, its distance, period of revolution, and even the mass of matter it contains. On the 18th of September, 1846, Leverrier requested his friend, Galle, of Berlin, to direct his telescope to that point of the heavens where his computations placed the new planet, and lo! it was actually found on the very first night the telescope was directed to it, within less than one degree of the place assigned it by Leverrier's computations. Thus was accomplished the most remarkable and boldest theorizing that has ever marked the career of astronomical science. Leverrier loved his science well, but his religion more.

Thus the *Univers*, in his obituary, says: "Far from concealing

his Catholic faith, he loved to confess it; a faith, whose demonstration and confirmation he beheld in the sublime science to which he had devoted his life. . . . For him, faith and science mutually enlightened each other. Therefore it was that his great mind never failed to bear testimony to the truth, protesting with all the authority which genius commands against the materialism of the age. After having asked for and received the last helps of religion, M. Leverrier gave up his soul to God."

While the scientific glory of Leverrier was in its zenith, that of Father P. A. Secchi, S. J., was rising above the horizon. "To Father Secchi is due the merit of having executed the first spectroscopic survey of the heavens. About 4000 stars were all passed in review by him, and classified according to the varying qualities of their light. His provisional establishment of four types of stellar spectra has proved a genuine aid to knowledge, through the facilities afforded by it for the arrangement and comparison of rapidly accumulating facts."¹ He is justly regarded as one of the effective founders of stellar spectroscopy. In Houzeau's "*Vade Mecum*" we find that he wrote more scientific articles in a given time than any of his contemporaries. His work on the sun is well known, and is reckoned among the most valuable in that department of astronomy.

Father Secchi's work belongs more properly to the third period in the development of the science of astronomy. His is the period of physical astronomy. Its investigations aim at knowing the heavenly bodies physically, and it is daily reaching its end by the improvements in the telescope and by the aid of the spectroscope and the photographic plate. It is the astronomy of our day, and Catholics are to be found in great numbers among the laborers in this field. Many of the great observatories of the world count Catholics on their working staffs, while special departments of the science are worked out in exclusively Catholic observatories. There is the observatory in Rome under the direction of Father Ferrari, S. J., where excellent work is done in the line of solar observations. We have also in the Eternal City the observatory in charge of Fr. Denza, and which was endowed by the liberality of the Holy Father. Many consider Father Fenyi, S. J., of the Kallocsa observatory, the most prominent observer of solar protuberances. The work inaugurated at Stonyhurst by Father Perry is still pursued with great activity by Father W. Sidgreaves, S. J., as may be gathered from the contributions appearing from his pen and that of Rev. A. Cortie, S. J. Father Braun, S. J., the first director of the Haynald observatory, has contributed much to science, as those who know his work on "*Cosmogony*" can attest.

¹ *History of Astronomy*, Clerke, p. 412.

C. F. Pechüle, an observer of Copenhagen, well known by his numerous short papers on astronomical subjects; De Ball, director of the Kuffner observatory in Vienna, a frequent contributor to astronomical journals; and Plassman, in Westphalia, author of a work on variable stars and of a star atlas for amateurs, and one of the founders of the German Astronomical Society for amateurs, are all Catholics. A work lately published, containing valuable zone observations, recalls the fact that the author, Lamont, of Munich, died fortified by the sacraments of the Church. In Kremsmünster, and in Grignon, the Benedictines have observatories, in the former, Father Wagner, and in the latter, Father Lamey, both with able assistants, are doing important work for the advancement of science.

But why increase the list? These names, with the brief sketch of their work, is evidence of the present activity of Catholics in the astronomical field. But one word of recognition for those laboring in our midst. The Catholic university at Washington already proves that Catholics appreciate work in the scientific field, and can take effective means for the advancement of scientific investigation. Already a magnificent 9-inch equatorial has been secured and placed in the hands of the professor of astronomy, Rev. Father Searle, C. S. P. This alone is a sufficient guarantee that good work will be initiated and carried through, and that astronomy will be indebted to the Catholic University of America for new and further developments. Father Searle is already known to the astronomical world, having computed the orbits of several comets and discovered an asteroid.

The Georgetown observatory, under the direction of Rev. J. Hagen, S. J., has lately attracted the attention of the scientific world by solving "a problem that has puzzled astronomers for half a century"; the problem, namely, of how to do away with that greatest of all the errors of observation, known to astronomers as the "personal equation." The invention referred to by the "Natur und Offenbarung," from which the above quotation is taken, is the "photochronograph" of Rev. G. Fargis, S. J. It was described in the October (1891) number of this magazine. The German magazine mentioned above says of it: "The importance of the new apparatus, not only for determining time and longitude, as the memoir (the Georgetown publication describing the invention) very modestly hints, but for celestial photography in general, ought to have been more fully brought out. One need but recall the recent failure of the determination of longitude between London and Paris. The English and French observers first did their work at home by telegraph; then they exchanged places to do the whole work over again, for the sole purpose of getting rid of the exas-

perating "personal equation." In spite of all this, a mistake of half a second remained. All these observers agree that the great expense of time and money is wasted, and that the whole labor will have to be done over again. Nay, it is proposed that the observers shall not only exchange places in London and Paris, but carry with them their own instruments. Now, all this would become entirely unnecessary if the new apparatus (photochronograph) just described were inserted at each end of the electric telegraph, thus setting aside the observers altogether. Georgetown College is the oldest Catholic educational establishment in the United States, and has lately celebrated the centenary of its foundation. We congratulate Georgetown College on following in the footsteps of the once-famous Roman College Observatory. Had the celebrated Father Secchi published this memoir, it would indeed be numbered among his very best achievements. Father Hagen, the director of the observatory, is well known by his mathematical work published last year, and by several valuable contributions on "variable stars."

We have already run beyond our limit with this imperfect and somewhat irregular enumeration. It will, however, serve to point out some of the work that has been done by Catholic astronomers in the past, and be an index of their activity in the present. It will be evidence, that while cherishing their faith, they love the light of scientific truth, and seek it as they do that of the sun and stars which bears the message they interpret so well.

D. T. O'SULLIVAN, S. J.

THE TWO KENRICKS.

A TASK of no ordinary weight and difficulty must be undertaken by the writer who is expected to summarize in a single article of the *AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW* a satisfactory dissertation on the lives and labors of two among the most illustrious prelates who have figured in the Church History of the United States. Yet such was the request made to and the obligation imposed on him by the editor, when the memorable celebration of Archbishop Kenrick's golden jubilee took place in St. Louis, towards the close of last year. It is almost needless to state, that as the title suggested furnishes a wide scope of subject matter and of treatment, the present attempt must prove to be a very imperfect record. Nevertheless, it may afford some partial information regarding those great pastors of souls, who have conducted their flocks into good pastures, and who have pointed the way to heaven by instruction and example. One of those venerable brothers long since has been called from earth to merit the rewards of eternal life, while the other still survives. As both were as closely united in ecclesiastical relations, as in brotherhood, so shall we endeavor to combine a few incidents of their lives, without further preliminary remarks.

In the southern part of the ancient city of Dublin there is a street, once held to have been highly fashionable, and, being in the neighborhood of the old Four Courts during the early period of the last century, it became the abode of several eminent lawyers. It bore then, as it does at the present time, the name of Chancery Lane. It is also in the immediate vicinity of Dublin Castle. When the magnificent new building, known as the Four Courts, had been erected on the northern bank of the River Liffy, a gradual migration of the lawyers was a natural result, and most of the fraternity took up their residence elsewhere, chiefly in the North Dublin streets and squares. A class of respectable merchants and manufacturers succeeded them towards the close of the last century; and even at the present time, those antique-looking houses, with fan-lights over their door-ways, furnish sufficient evidence of former home comforts and a peculiar conventional style. The house No. 16 was occupied by Thomas and Jane Kenrick, the parents of those illustrious brothers, in the early years of the present century; and in it was born the younger of the two, as the writer learned by inquiry from the Archbishop himself. That

house still stands, four stories in height, with a passage way in front.

Not having any authentic information regarding other members of the family, it must suffice to state, that Francis Patrick Kenrick was born in Dublin, on the 3d of December, 1797, and that in the schools of his native city he received an elegant classical and a sound Catholic education. His uncle was the Rev. Richard Kenrick, who became parish priest of St. Nicholas of Myra, and who was distinguished for his charities to the poor. That venerable man was universally loved and respected during life, and after death he was greatly lamented. He took an especial interest in training his youthful nephews to habits and practices of piety. Francis Patrick became a member of the Purgatorian Society for men, who frequently assembled on evenings to recite the office of the dead, as also on Sundays and Holy days to teach Christian Doctrine in the parish church to boys. When about to leave Dublin and continue his studies in Rome as an aspirant to the sacred ministry, he introduced his younger brother, destined to be the future Archbishop of St. Louis, to take his place in that pious confraternity, although then only nine years old. The duty thus imposed on him was well fulfilled, and at the present day, members of that Confraternity at St. Nicholas of Myra's Church, Francis Street, rejoice to have had two such distinguished and devout brothers on the rolls of their sodality, while they deem it a great honor and advantage to have such a record and such examples still to animate their zeal and inspire devotion.

Having evinced an early call to the service of the Church, and having made good progress in all his studies, at the age of eighteen Francis Patrick went to Rome, there to complete his course and to receive ecclesiastical training. He also felt a desire to embrace the religious state, and he spent two years in the house of the Lazarists. But he was destined to move in a different sphere, and the United States Foreign Missions were to derive special advantage from his exemplary character and varied qualifications.

Four years were passed in the College of the Propaganda, where he was distinguished as an indefatigable student, and as a profoundly learned philosopher, canonist and theologian. A regular observer of rule and discipline, he was also noted for his suavity of disposition and for his great piety. Already had he given indications of signal ability and remarkable scholarship; while even then his habit of writing and of taking notes for class exercises gave him facilities in the practice of composition, which enabled him in after life to utilize the knowledge acquired, for the instruction and benefit of so many other ecclesiastics.

He sailed to the United States in 1821, and on arriving there, set out for the distant State of Kentucky, in which the venerable Bishop Flaget ruled the See of Bardstown. There a theological seminary had been established, known as St. Joseph's College. The Rev. Mr. Kenrick was appointed one of its professors, while he attended likewise to the duties of St. Joseph's Church adjoining. In the college were eighteen ecclesiastical students preparing for holy orders, while ten seminarians, pursuing their theological course, acted as tutors or prefects over about two hundred pupils. He had been sent there especially from Rome, to train priests for the rising missions of the West.

On the accession of Pope Leo XII. to the pontifical throne, an indulgence in the form of a jubilee had been proclaimed, and Bishop Flaget convened the priests of his diocese for a spiritual retreat the first week of September, 1826. On the 10th of that month the jubilee was promulgated in his cathedral, and the exercises were begun. Afterwards, he proposed to visit each congregation in his diocese, attended by Rev. Mr. Kenrick, who gave a series of instructions and religious exercises.

When travelling was practicable he continued the work of his Divine Master, and at the close of a sermon in Springfield a Presbyterian minister, the Rev. Mr. Sneed, attempted to reply to Father Kenrick's arguments; but the acute and accomplished theologian fully exposed his presumption and ignorance while demolishing his sophistries. The Protestants who were present listened with attention to that controversy; and while they were deeply impressed with the utter defeat of their advocate, it was an occasion of great rejoicing for the Catholics. During this season of grace, nearly all the faithful in Kentucky approached the sacraments, while in 21 congregations 1216 were confirmed and more than 6000 approached Holy Communion.

An impostor, representing himself to be a priest and bishop-elect of Illinois, had taken advantage of that religious revival, and sought to profit by it when, avoiding the route of the bishop and his missionaries, he preached in some parts of Kentucky and Illinois. Soon, however, his knavery was exposed, through the exertions of Rev. Francis P. Kenrick and another zealous priest, Rev. John Timon, afterwards first Bishop of Buffalo. During the progress of that celebrated mission, numbers of Catholics, formerly very indifferent to their Christian obligations, became afterwards practical and fervent. The missionaries toiled in season and out of season during the time, though often exposed to serious inconvenience and discomforts, owing to the difficulty of travelling over rough roads and of finding suitable lodgings.

Under the signature of Omega, a Rev. Dr. Blackburn had im-

pugned the Catholic doctrine regarding the Blessed Eucharist in that part of the country; and in 1828, under the signature of Omicron, a reply was published by Father Francis P. Kenrick, which fully established the truth of that dogma.

For nine years Father Kenrick remained at Bardstown, and during that time not only did he most sedulously attend to his duties as teacher at the seminary, but he engaged on a vast field of missionary labor throughout the scattered Catholic stations and settlements in that extensive diocese. He preached many sermons and expounded the doctrines of the Catholic Church so learnedly and yet so clearly to the members of various congregations that his fame went abroad, and numbers of Protestants flocked to hear him. Among these, on one occasion, was the celebrated Kentucky senator, Hon. Henry Clay.

For a long time the diocese of Philadelphia had been unhappily disturbed by schism, owing to the system of lay-trusteeism which then prevailed in the American Church. The aged bishop of that see, Rt. Rev. Henry Conwell, required an able assistant to relieve him from the complications and difficulties which so greatly oppressed him. Accordingly, the Rev. Francis Patrick Kenrick's well-established reputation for piety, ability, and judgment caused his recommendation for that office to the Sovereign Pontiff, with powers for the administration of the diocese.

He was therefore appointed coadjutor to Rt. Rev. Bishop Conwell, with right of succession. When the latter heard of that appointment he set out for Kentucky, although oppressed with the weight of years and troubles, to assist at the consecration. This sacred function was discharged by the venerable Bishop Flaget, who was grieved to lose the services of his attached friend and companion; but in pursuance of the bulls received from Rome, the coming festival of the Holy Trinity was named for the ceremony. Accordingly, Rev. Francis Patrick Kenrick was consecrated Bishop of Arath *in partibus infidelium*, on the 6th of June, 1830. The assisting prelates were the Rt. Rev. Bishop Conwell and Rt. Rev. John Baptist David. The Rt. Rev. John England, Bishop of Charleston, and Rt. Rev. Dr. Fenwick, Bishop of Cincinnati, were also present on that occasion. Soon afterwards, accompanied by Rt. Rev. Dr. Conwell, the newly consecrated bishop, taking Pittsburgh on the way, set out for Philadelphia, and arrived there on the 7th of July. Meantime, in that city, the energetic and talented Rev. John Hughes, afterwards Archbishop of New York, very ably cared for the interests of religion.

On arriving there, and on becoming acquainted with the state of affairs, Bishop Kenrick assumed control as administrator of the diocese, and soon he was actively engaged on a visitation of the

more remote parts, where he dedicated churches and administered confirmation. In September he gave Holy Orders, in the old church of Conewago, to five candidates presented by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Bruté; but at Chambersburg he was prostrated by fever for a time. Hearing of the Bishop's illness, the Rev. John Hughes went to his relief. On the 14th of November, Dr. Kenrick proclaimed the Jubilee in St. Mary's Church, of which he assumed the pastoral charge, and so notified the trustees on the 27th of December following. This created not a little opposition on their part, for they had resolved on keeping up the claim of patronage, to nominate their pastor, and to regulate the allowance for his support. But they had now to deal with a prelate who, despite his unobtrusive and quiet deportment, had a force of character and resolution more than sufficient to cope with such obstacles. Bishop Kenrick addressed a circular to the pew-holders on the 12th of April, 1831, which announced to them that it would be his duty to interdict the church unless all opposition ceased, and the Catholic principle of ecclesiastical government should be unequivocally allowed. To this mandate the trustees issued an evasive answer, and far from being satisfactory. Whereupon, Bishop Kenrick ordered the cessation of all sacred functions in St. Mary's Church, or in the burial-ground attached to it, after 12 o'clock on the 16th of April, unless the trustees signed a distinct disclaimer of these usurped functions. This, at first, they declined to do; however, after some attempts at opposition, they submitted. On the 28th of May, St. Mary's Church was again opened, and thus a long succession of scandals happily ceased.

The circumstances of the time and situation caused the Bishop to resolve on building a church which should be absolutely free from trustee dictatorship; and, aided by the Rev. John Hughes, he was enabled to secure a suitable site. He laid the cornerstone of a church under the patronage of St. John the Evangelist, in May, 1831, and the work was prosecuted so actively by Rev. John Hughes that Bishop Conwell officiated at its solemn dedication in April, 1832. This same year, also, Dr. Kenrick held the first Philadelphia Synod. In it several most salutary statutes were enacted for the regulation of discipline throughout the diocese. He next turned his attention to the establishment of an ecclesiastical seminary, and aided by generous subscriptions, he was soon enabled to effect that cherished project in a building on Fourth Street. His brother, lately ordained a priest in the diocese of Dublin, was requested to undertake the duty of acting as director in the training of young levites to supply missionary voids in the diocese.

It is now expedient to introduce the subject of his younger

brother, Peter Richard, to the reader's notice. He was born in Dublin, in the house No. 16 Chancery Lane, on the 17th of August, 1806. There, likewise, he lived until about two years before he entered the College of Maynooth, where, as a student, he manifested those remarkable qualities of intellect and of heart that gave earnest of his future grand career.

His preliminary course of studies began and continued in his native parish, under the immediate direction of his venerable uncle, the Very Rev. Richard Kenrick. The nephew became an accomplished classical scholar, while, besides the knowledge of Greek and Latin acquired in school, he cultivated a taste for other languages. The first lessons of German he learned in Dublin were taught him by the celebrated and gifted poet, James Clarence Mangan; and, in after-life, the Archbishop often spoke about his former tutor, for whose genius he had a most unbounded admiration, and who was so gentle and amiable in disposition. Moreover, he felt compassion and consideration for a weakness of character which led that unfortunate young man to occasional fits of inebriety that served to cloud his latter years with despondency.

The vocation of Peter Richard being manifestly for the ecclesiastical state, he entered St. Patrick's College, Maynooth in 1827, and there he was particularly distinguished among the students of that great establishment. But he did not glory in that distinction. On the contrary, we have been assured by a former fellow-curate of his at Rathmines, the late very Rev. Nicholas Canon Roche, afterwards parish priest of St. Michael and St. John, Dublin, that he often heard it stated by contemporaneous class-fellows that while Peter Richard was universally admired and respected for character and talents by professors and students, he would ever modestly seek to conceal, rather than display, his superiority over others. Whenever he was called in class, he was recognized by all as having thoroughly mastered the subject on which he was examined, while in the most retiring and humble manner he disclaimed those praises which were so freely bestowed upon him.

Ordained by the Most Rev. Daniel Murray, then Ordinary of the Dublin diocese, on the 6th of March, 1832, the Rev. Peter Richard Kenrick at first served in the Archbishop's mensal parish and in the Cathedral, Marlborough Street. After a short term, he was appointed curate in Rathmines parish, a southern suburb of Dublin. Just two years before his ordination, the Rt. Rev. Francis Patrick Kenrick, who volunteered for the American missions, had been consecrated as the third prelate of Philadelphia, and now he was greatly anxious to receive assistance from a brother whose high character and talents had been already so well established.

The Rev. Peter Richard arrived in the United States towards

the close of the year 1833, and then took up his position in Philadelphia. There he had charge of the theological seminary as President, where he conducted the discipline and course of studies in such manner as to gain the respect and affections of teachers and students.

In several of the city parishes he preached learned and eloquent sermons, which always engaged the attention and admiration of his hearers, many Protestants being present; and even on these he often produced the most deep and salutary impressions.

A religious weekly periodical, the *Catholic Herald*, had been established in Philadelphia, and soon his profound theological and historical knowledge, with his practiced facility in literary composition, made it sufficiently manifest that the Very Rev. Peter Richard was possessed of journalistic ability which must render the paper most efficient should he assume its direction as editor. Accordingly, his ready pen was engaged to furnish the leading articles, and it is to be hoped that at some date not too distant, an effort shall be made to identify and rescue from oblivion at least many of those compositions which have more than ephemeral interest to recommend them.

In addition to his other responsibilities, the Rev. Peter Richard was appointed Rector of the Cathedral. He discharged the obligations of a pastor with that ease of manner and affability of disposition which so greatly characterized him; while he was ever at the post of duty with an exactness and a regularity noticed by all who had occasion to avail themselves of his priestly offices.

He also discharged the functions of vicar-general to the bishop, who ever found in him a diligent and faithful assistant, as also a wise and capable counsellor. The affectionate relations existing between both of these distinguished brothers was productive of most perfect harmony and unity of action.

From the very first year he assumed charge of the see to the very last year of his life, Bishop Francis Patrick Kenrick never ceased to make the round of his churches and congregations for the purpose of administering confirmation, of dedicating churches, and of holding visitations. Thus, from personal inspection and observation, he had a most correct knowledge of the state in which the various missionary stations were, and he was all the better enabled to co-operate with the respective pastors in forwarding their interests and in effecting improvements. During the years 1832 and 1833, when Asiatic cholera spread its fearful ravages in Philadelphia, in conjunction with his clergy and religious, the bishop made every possible provision to stay its progress, while he exhorted the Catholics by prayer and works of penance to avert

the anger of God, and to prepare, by devoutly frequenting the sacraments for a sudden death.

The Coadjutor Bishop of Philadelphia had secured a residence for himself, where he had opened a small theological seminary, and there he planted that mustard-seed which, before many years had elapsed, grew into one much finer in point of size and situation, until it developed into the present magnificent collegiate establishment, so beautifully situated about five or six miles from the city. Each of these seminaries had been successively dedicated to St. Charles Borromeo. The two former have since merged into different religious institutions. In 1835 that seminary, of which the Rev. Peter R. Kenrick was superior, had ten seminarians. That same year, also, the bishop originated a Seminary Fund Society for its maintenance, and this produced most excellent results. The house accommodations soon proved wholly inadequate for the increasing number of students, and an unfinished building, with its plot, on Eighteenth and Race Streets, facing on Logan Square, was procured. For the new seminary a charter of incorporation was obtained, April 13, 1838.

Vast indeed was the extent of Philadelphia Diocese at this time, comprising not alone the States of Pennsylvania and Delaware, but even New Jersey in part. The growth of churches, chapels, and missionary stations, with the increase of religious institutions, had now convinced Bishop Kenrick that it must prove absolutely impossible for him to supervise in detail the business affairs of that diocese, and to fulfil all the active duties of his position. On the 25th of July, 1835, he wrote to the Propaganda explaining the immense labor which had to be undergone, and strongly recommending the division of western Pennsylvania, with the erection of its see at Pittsburgh. He also stated that he was ready to assume the organization, in person, of the new diocese, while recommending the appointment of Rev. John Hughes as Bishop of Philadelphia. Although the Congregation De Propaganda Fide considered these representations, further action was deferred by the Pope until the assembling of the next Provincial Council. However, when it met in 1837 the bishop was doomed to disappointment; and it is almost incredible how he was able to sustain for many subsequent years the fatigues and burdens daily accumulating on him. He was aided by his brother Peter Richard, whom he appointed his Vicar-General.

The ministers and members of the Protestant Episcopal denomination in the United States were a numerous and an influential body at that time, as they are in the present day, and the vicar-general considered his labor would be well bestowed in the production of a book calculated to treat a subject of prime interest

and fraught with important relations to them, yet in a historical line of investigation and inquiry which should avoid the wrangle or bitterness of theological polemics. Accordingly, a very admirable and researchful work, "The Validity of Anglican Ordinations Examined," was the product of his pen, and in it that whole subject was most lucidly stated in a didactic manner, with proofs adduced from English and other historic writers for the facts related in the text, and inferences to be drawn from the weight of evidence, ably digested and arrayed in support of his positive and negative thesis. When this book first appeared, and at a time when religious controversy had been greatly in vogue, attention was at once drawn to the matter it contained and to the manner of its treatment, while it attracted very general notice among Protestants as well as Catholics. It even created serious doubts regarding their actual position in the minds of many highly educated and earnest persons of the Protestant Episcopal communion, not alone in the United States, but likewise in the British Islands. That first edition was eagerly sought for and soon exhausted. It evoked replies, also, not alone in the United States of America, but in Europe. However, it made no enemies for the author, but, on the contrary, it earned the respectful consideration of many members of the Episcopalian denomination, and even among their clergy he had many sincere friends. However, from the press in Baltimore a gentleman named Hugh Davey Evans issued a reply in 1844, entitled "Essays to Prove the Validity of Anglican Ordinations: in Answer to the Right Reverend Peter Richard Kenrick, R. C. Bishop of St. Louis," by a layman.

Soon afterwards, in England, the Rev. John Fuller Russell, B.C.L., incumbent of St. James Church, Enfield, published a work, "Anglican Ordinations Valid—A Refutation of Certain Statements in the Second and Third Chapters of 'The Validity of Anglican Ordinations Examined,' by the Very Reverend Peter Richard Kenrick, V. G." That treatise was issued from the London press in 1846.

His tender devotion to the ever Blessed and Immaculate Virgin urged him to compile and publish "The New Month of Mary; or, Reflections for each Day of the Month on the different Titles applied to the Holy Mother of God in the Litany of Loretto. Principally designed for the Month of May." It was published at Philadelphia in the year 1840. Reflections, examples, prayers and practices are orderly arranged for each day, with discriminating judgment, taste and religious feeling pervading the whole. Its publication served greatly to promote the May devotions. It passed through several editions, not only in America but in Europe, and it is still extensively used. A "History of the Holy House of

Loretto " was also published by him, and it contains matter of very curious interest. An investigation of past records and traditions, relating to that celebrated place of pilgrimage, throws light on a subject not sufficiently known, especially to English readers; while the research and historic lore of the writer are abundantly evidenced in every page of that remarkable little guide-book to the shrine.

But admirable as were the writings of the younger brother, those of Francis Patrick were still more important and voluminous.

With a just discrimination and ability which so greatly distinguished him, while the Most Rev. Ambrose Marechal, Archbishop of Baltimore, had discharged the previous duties of theological professor in St. Mary's seminary, he often regretted the want of a theological text-book suited to the actual requirements of the Church in the United States. Had time, means and opportunity been afforded, it seemed likely he would willingly have undertaken the task of publishing a theology dealing more especially with the variations of creed among the sects, with the modern themes of religious controversy, as also with the philosophical, moral, social and political condition of affairs in the great and growing republic. It was found, likewise, that among the most approved treatises then issued in Europe, no single writer could be mentioned who had forecast or grappled with the difficulty, or who had supplied the remedy. However, when consecrated and obliged to discharge the absorbing duties of his high station, no hope remained for accomplishing such a task; but he and other ecclesiastics urged it on Dr. Kenrick, whose learning and ability were sure to achieve a useful and satisfactory result. Hardly was sufficient leisure afforded for preparing a finished theological course, the library materials for reference were very incomplete, and, more than all, few erudite theologians could be consulted; yet these objections were overruled, and in obedience to the desires of his brothers, Bishop Kenrick set himself down to accomplish a task of no ordinary magnitude and yet of special importance. In the series of his best-known works, and which must have engaged the studious labors of many years, the first volume of his "*Theologiæ Dogmaticæ*" *Tractatus Tres, De Revelatione, De Ecclesia, et De Verbo Dei*, appeared from the press in Philadelphia. This was succeeded by the second volume, containing *Tractatus Generalis, De Christo Deo, De Sanctissima Trinitate, De Redemptore, De Gratia Christi*, in the year following, pp. 407. The third volume, issued also in 1840, contained his *Treatises De Baptismo, De Confirmatione, De Eucharistia, De Pænitentia, De Indulgentiis, De Extrema Unctione*, pp. 411. Also, during the same year, the fourth and concluding volume of this learned theological work was published, and it contained the *Tracts: De Sacris Ordinibus, De*

Matrimonio, De Sacramentis in Universum, De Cultu Religioso, De Vita Futura. To this was added three most useful historical appendices: 1. Heresum et Schismatum Recensio; 2. Conciliorum Œcumenicorum Notitia; 3. Romanorum Pontificum Series, pp. 404.

But if the volumes published on "Dogmatic Theology" were most useful and necessary for exposition and defence of the faith; not less was it deemed to be essential, for ecclesiastical students in the seminaries then established, and likely soon to be increased in number, within the United States, to have a "Moral Theology" compiled, accommodated and applicable to the ecclesiastical laws or censures then in force, as also explaining the provisions of the general and subordinate constitutions in the civil code and jurisprudence so varied in the different States, and often referring to cases of conscience. Accordingly, the first volume of "Theologia Moralis" concinnata a Francisco Patricio Kenrick, Episcopo Arathensi, et Coadjutore Episcopi Philadelphiensis, was published at Philadelphia, MDCCCXLI., by Eugene Cummiskey. It contained the following treatises, "De Actibus Humanis," "De Conscientia," "De Lege Divina," "De Legibus Ecclesiasticis," "De Jure Gentium," "De Legibus Civilibus," "De Pecatis," "De Obligationibus Specialibus," pp. 404.

Next year, the second volume of this work appeared, containing the tracts "De Virtutibus Moralibus," "De Justicia," "De Contractibus," "De Virtute Religionis," pp. 411. The third volume did not appear until 1843, and it contained his treatises "De Sacramentis in Universum," "De Baptismo," "De Confirmatione," "De Eucharistia," "De Pœnitentia," "De Extrema Unctione," "De Ordine," "De Matrimonio," pp. 370. The Venerable Pontiff, Pope Gregory XVI. sent him apostolic letters approving of his episcopal actions and literary labors.

In 1841, he found time to issue a work, "The Catholic Doctrine of Justification Vindicated and Explained." Besides his various pastorals he wrote a letter on Christian Union, which attracted much attention and interest at the time of its issue. During this year, likewise, appeared his learned "Treatise on Baptism," most requisite to elucidate the many questions then debated, and especially in the United States, regarding its nature, mode and efficacy. In 1844 his highly esteemed book, "The Primacy of the Apostolic See Vindicated," was published. It is needless to state that the whole of that important subject has been thoroughly elucidated and explained in a manner to merit the just commendation of every Catholic reader.

When religious intolerance was manifested in those disgraceful riots, which broke out in 1844, and which caused such loss of life

and destruction of churches in Philadelphia, Bishop Kenrick issued an address counselling all Catholics to patience and preservation of the peace. This was a period of great excitement and alarm, but the prudence and influence of the bishop succeeded in allaying the bitter feelings, which were so wantonly provoked, while some of the leading non-Catholic citizens were moved to express sorrow and indignation at the outrages perpetrated by the mob, who for a time set the authorities at defiance. His writings likewise served to dissipate religious prejudices.

In 1849 the Bishop of Philadelphia published a work, "A Vindication of the Catholic Church;" its object was to exhibit and prove the claims and characteristics of Christ's Holy Spouse, "the Pillar and the Ground of Truth."

To return to the younger brother: In the year 1846, the Rt. Rev. Joseph Rosati, then in a state of failing health, having visited Rome and postulated his Holiness, Pope Gregory XVI., for a coadjutor and a successor in the person of Very Rev. Peter Richard Kenrick, the first bishop of St. Louis, obtained his request. This was not in accordance with the wishes of the selected coadjutor, who would willingly have declined such promotion, and he protested, but in vain, that another sphere of life would better satisfy his aspirations. However, his Holiness would not yield, and Father Kenrick was obliged to submit. At that time Rt. Rev. Bishop Rosati had been nominated Apostolic Delegate from the Holy See for the purpose of negotiating a settlement of some ecclesiastical questions pending in the Republic of Hayti, and he had accepted that difficult and delicate trust.

Both Bishop Rosati and Father Kenrick returned to the United States, and arrived in Boston on the 18th of November, and soon afterwards setting out for Philadelphia, preparations were made for the episcopal consecration. The Church of St. Mary in that city had been selected as most appropriate for the performance of that sacred function. Bishop Rosati desired to be the consecrator of his coadjutor and immediate successor in the See of St. Louis. Accordingly, on the 30th of November, the Feast of St. Andrew the Apostle, 1841, the consecration took place, the Coadjutor-Bishop of Philadelphia, and Bishop Lefevre, the coadjutor of Detroit, being assistants. The celebrated Rt. Rev. John England, Bishop of Charleston, preached on that occasion to a large and greatly interested congregation.

Thenceforth, on the Rt. Rev. Coadjutor-Bishop of St. Louis devolved the active administration of a diocese, then embracing a vast extent of territory. It included all Missouri and Illinois, with many distant regions towards the west, and even reaching to the Rocky Mountains, while at present forming so many independent

States. Now five Metropolitan Sees and twenty-one ordinary dioceses are included within it. Before that period not one Plenary Council had been held in the United States, and it is a unique distinction that the Most Rev. Peter Richard Kenrick is now the only prelate who has attended all those assemblages; on the last occasion of meeting in Baltimore, especial honors were paid him by his episcopal colleagues. After his consecration, the Rt. Rev. Peter Richard Kenrick did not remain long in Philadelphia before he set out for Missouri, and on the 24th of December he landed at St. Genevieve, where he was received by the Lazarists in their new college, and where he celebrated Mass on the morning of next day, which was Christmas. Soon afterwards he took passage for St. Louis, and when there he occupied the house adjoining the cathedral, and which has since disappeared to make room for other buildings.

On the 25th of September, 1843, the saintly Bishop Rosati departed this life in Rome, and Bishop Kenrick then succeeded him in St. Louis. Although buried in the beautiful little chapel dedicated to St. Vincent de Paul, and in the church of the Lazarists at Monte Citario, yet were the solemn obsequies for the dead celebrated with becoming ceremony in the cathedral church of his diocese.

In 1847, St. Louis was erected into an archbishopric. During those days the archbishop dwelt with the clergy attached to the cathedral, in a house adjoining and long since removed to make room for the presbytery which at present occupies a part of that site. He took upon himself the chief duty of preaching in English on Sundays and the greater festivals throughout the year, as the other priests were, for the most part, either French or German. His very appearance and manner in the pulpit were sermons, in reality; and when he spoke, always slowly, distinctly, and earnestly, it was easy to follow his statements and reasoning. The impressions produced on his hearers were serious and convincing. His accent and tone of voice were clear and far-reaching; while his figure, regular and handsome features, graceful gestures, and evident self-possession, with his mastery of subject, were admired by an ever attentive and delighted congregation. The executive labors and financial labors of Most Rev. Dr. Kenrick, in connection with ecclesiastical affairs, were then very engrossing, for he was constantly engaged in securing sites and obtaining title-deeds, for the purpose of building churches, religious institutions and schools. Even then he had a clear insight regarding the future growth of St. Louis. Money had to be procured, and debts often contracted were a cause of anxious concern in the midst of his many functions.

It was his custom, during the Lenten seasons, and after the evening devotions, to deliver a course of lectures, which were most instructive, in the cathedral; and these were admired, not alone by Catholics, but by many others of various denominations who assembled in the church. These were on a number of different subjects, dogmatic and moral; sometimes relating to the Evidences of Christianity, to Divine Revelation, to the Chief Mysteries of Religion, or to the Marks of the True Church; sometimes referring to the Sacraments, to the Ecclesiastical Law, to Religious Rites and Discipline, or to the Moral Virtues. Nor could he have devoted much time for the preparation of those questions which he treated, as he was otherwise busily employed during the early hours of the day. This practice, generally known throughout the city, induced numbers of non-Catholics to frequent the church, and having been interested and instructed by his arguments and expositions, they afterwards sought interviews with him or some of the city clergy. Thus many well-disposed and distinguished persons were afterwards received into the Church, and became fervent and exemplary Catholics.

It would be difficult to understand how he could manage the amount of executive and administrative work which had to be performed in his new capacity, did we not take into account the methodical and business-like order of his daily life, and the economical distribution of time, which he regarded as most precious for the proper fulfilment of every duty. His disciplinary habits assured him that much of it could not be wasted owing to the very early hour of five o'clock, at which he failed not to rise each morning. Then, he usually engaged after morning prayer in reciting the greater part of the divine office, so as to be prepared for the multiplied daily duties and labors which, afterwards, were sure to occupy his attention. He went each morning into the confessional before six o'clock, when he heard the confessions of many penitents. At six, he commenced the celebration of Mass in the cathedral, with a great spirit of devotion and reverence. Nothing could be more admirable than his exact distribution of time, as the writer, who lived with him, had frequently an opportunity for observing, while all the priests in the house attached to the cathedral, noticed how his varied duties and occupations succeeded each other, regularly as the clock told the hour. He was the earliest riser in the house, and long before others left their beds, he was systematically out, during the fine summer mornings, on the verandah, pacing noiselessly in soft slippers, while reciting most devoutly the divine offices. During the cold and short winter days, however, he arose and then lighted his own fire, and thus confined to his room he read by the lighted

lamp. He breakfasted at an early hour, and then withdrew to his library, which was retired from a parlor and an inner waiting-room. Soon afterwards, a succession of visitors, clergy and laity, Catholics and non-Catholics, arrived, and these interviews, on matters of business and interest, engaged the greater part of the forenoon; nor were they wholly discontinued at later hours of the day. Some snatches of time he managed to take for reading and writing; but it was always a curious mystery to speculate on what work he had been engaged, and, although it was observable that he kept piles of reference-books beside him, with sheets of manuscript and printed slips or revises, yet none of his priests chose to inquire about what he seemed to wish should remain a secret, until it became known to readers at large.

When, by direction of His Holiness Pope Pius IX., the first National Council of the Catholic Church in the United States assembled at Baltimore, May 6, 1849, he and the prelate of that see were the only archbishops of the twenty-six ordinaries who were present. Then it was recommended to Rome that the metropolitan dignity should be conferred upon New York, Cincinnati, New Orleans, and Oregon City. None of the suffragans then located in his province are now alive, while he is at present the senior prelate of the whole United States hierarchy, comprising thirteen archbishops and sixty-seven bishops, besides six vicars apostolic. After assuming charge of the St. Louis diocese, he seldom met the bishop, his brother, except on those occasions when he was obliged to assist at the Councils assembled in Baltimore, and when he took Philadelphia on his way in going or returning. Yet both had much to confer about in respect to their several charges, and their correspondence by letters was very constant.

On the death of Archbishop Eccleston in 1851, Bishop Francis Patrick Kenrick of Philadelphia was transferred to the Archiepiscopal See of Baltimore. At the same time he was appointed Apostolic Legate to preside over the first Plenary Council ever held in the United States. It was convened at Baltimore in 1852, and it was opened in a very imposing manner with solemn ceremonies. Its decrees were also fraught with important regulations for the interests of the Church throughout the United States.

The See of Baltimore was given a certain primacy of honor, in 1859, by His Holiness Pope Pius IX. This gave its occupant precedence over all other prelates in the United States.

When the great Confederate war broke out, the archbishop impressed upon his people their obligations and duties towards the general government. He also enjoined on them obedience to the laws and to the justly constituted authorities. His principal religious services were preceded by public prayers for the President

of the United States and for the Federal authorities. This practice he continued during the remainder of his life.

The Archbishop of Baltimore, at this time, had long been engaged on a work requiring great erudition and study to bring it out. This was nothing less than a new English translation, with numerous commentaries, of the Old and New Testaments. He had already published some volumes before his lamented death, but he did not live to complete it.

On the morning of July 8, 1863, the venerable archbishop was found dead, although no previous complaints of suffering or of ill-health had been heard from him. The mournful intelligence was soon diffused over Baltimore, and not alone the Catholics, but citizens of all denominations were profoundly grieved. With the speed of lightning and on the wings of the press, the message was borne to St. Louis; yet the archbishop had no intimation of his bereavement when he was preparing to celebrate Mass on the morning following. One of the priests attached to the cathedral, however, had read the telegraphic account in a St. Louis morning paper. Knowing that the archbishop had not then been notified, the priest approached him and pleadingly inquired if the archbishop's Mass could be offered for a most special intention. On assenting to such request, he was allowed to celebrate that Mass, and afterwards to make his usual thanksgiving before the priest announced to him that the Archbishop of Baltimore had died suddenly the morning before, and that the Holy Sacrifice just offered had been for the eternal repose of his soul. That a brother so endeared to him should have been so unexpectedly removed by death was painfully felt, and that it produced acute sorrow was well known, yet it seemed surprising to the priest conveying such news that it was received with apparently a heroic calmness and meek resignation to God's holy will, while thoughts too deep for utterance were buried in the soul of him who then only offered a short prayer invoking the divine mercy on behalf of one so long his guide, counsellor, and chiefest friend.

After the civil war was over, and when Missouri was destined to amend her old Constitution, the delegates who had assembled in convention for that purpose in April, 1865, adopted certain regulations respecting the clergy, of an imprudent and even of an illegal character. A most objectionable form of oath with certain conditions of reservation and test was sought to be imposed on them. This the archbishop of St. Louis and his priests strenuously refused to take, although for refusal to do so penalties were imposed. He would not allow to the State authorities those powers they claimed, for the giving of permission to preach the word of God, and for the discharge of other sacred functions.

This oath moreover he believed to be unconstitutional, and his opinion was fully confirmed by a subsequent declaration of the United States Supreme Court. In 1868, the archbishop, in company with his Vicar-General, Very Rev. Patrick John Ryan, Pastor of the Church of St. John the Evangelist, taking Ireland on the way, paid a visit to Rome, besides making a tour in other parts of Europe.

The disturbed state of society and of business consequent on the Confederate rebellion beginning to set in, the archbishop desired to relieve himself from further monetary responsibility in connection with his banking affairs. He showed a wise forecast of the property depreciation and commercial failures that soon began to prevail; so that when he resolved to wind up the financial concerns of the bank, he proposed, that if priests and congregations burdened with any debt for ecclesiastical institutions should pay one-half of it within a time fixed, he undertook to wipe out the remainder. Hitherto, he had been charged with numberless obligations as trustee for all church property within his diocese. His proposed plan succeeded in the most satisfactory manner, and he felt greatly relieved in mind when the liquidation was completed in every way to his satisfaction.

When the great Vatican Council was summoned to meet at Rome in 1870, by His Holiness Pope Pius IX., in company with nearly all the prelates of the United States, the archbishop of St. Louis attended, and the most important subject there considered and debated was the proposed dogma regarding the intallibility of the Pope in reference to decisions on faith and morals. While this doctrine had been received and upheld as a theological opinion by many learned doctors, others had maintained the contrary opinion, and believed, with the archbishop, that its definition was inopportune, and might prove injurious to religion, because among other reasons assigned, it was almost certain to be misunderstood by many non-Catholics. The action taken by His Grace of St. Louis is generally known, while his arguments against the definition are contained in a tract published at Naples, "*Oratio habenda, non habita.*" One of the leading prelates in the Council, and afterwards a Cardinal, inquired of Archbishop McCloskey, the late Cardinal of New York, what had been the character in the United States of that strange and courageous prelate of St. Louis. The archbishop replied, that he was a man of great virtue and great learning, and that the American bishops for thirty years had looked up to him as a model. However, when the doctrine had been defined, Archbishop Kenrick submitted fully to that definition. On his return to St. Louis, a splendid public reception awaited him, on the part of his priests and

people. An address was prepared, likewise, and read by the Very Rev. Patrick John Ryan, Vicar-General, in which allusion was made to his motives and action in the Vatican Council. This was pronounced before an immense congregation in the Church of St. John the Evangelist. To it a remarkable reply was publicly returned by the archbishop, in which while he briefly stated his motives for opposition to the definition of that proposed dogma, he added: "The motive of my submission is simply and singly the authority of the Catholic Church." Some years ago, while the present archbishop of Philadelphia was in Rome, the late Cardinal Manning said to him: "No two persons could be more opposed than the archbishop of St. Louis and myself at the council, but I am thoroughly convinced that he is a great priest and a good man."

Until the year 1872, the veteran prelate of St. Louis had continued the administration of his diocese without a bishop assistant; but at the solicitation of his many friends, who thought he was overtaxing himself, he applied to Rome for a coadjutor. His Vicar-General and Pastor of St. John the Evangelist's Church, Very Rev. Patrick John Ryan, had long ministered in the city, and—celebrated for gifts of oratory in an eminent degree, as also most zealous in the discharge of every sacerdotal duty—he had been recommended for that office. Accordingly he was appointed, with the title bishop of Tricomia, *in partibus infidelium*, and having right of succession to the See of St. Louis. His consecration took place on the 14th of April, 1872, the Most Rev. Peter Richard Kenrick officiating as consecrator, while a vast congregation was present during that solemn ceremony. This event gave a respite to the archbishop's labors, in relation to many of his episcopal functions, and his leisure moments were chiefly employed in study and pious exercises.

The See of Philadelphia having been vacant for a considerable time, His Holiness Pope Leo XIII. appointed the coadjutor bishop of St. Louis to that see, in June, 1884. Meanwhile, the city of St. Louis had made giant strides, and the growth of a Catholic population kept pace fully with its increase. Colleges and schools, churches and chapels, asylums and orphanages, hospitals and reformatories, orders and sodalities, conferences and associations, were established in every direction. Secular and religious clergy were numerous and ministered to the various wants of their respective congregations. Thus had the archbishop provided for every form of human misery, and for every object of Christian charity, during his long period of administration.

When the Most Rev. Patrick John Ryan had been removed from the Mound City, it was remarked as a curious coincidence that as

St. Louis had taken a bishop from Philadelphia in Dr. Rosati's day, she sent an archbishop back to it in return. At that time many friends of the aged prelate feared that the many duties of a multiplied character which had grown day by day must prove too onerous for their effective discharge, notwithstanding his great ability, natural energy, and force of character. However, he preferred resuming personally the active functions of the episcopacy and the entire administration of his see without extraneous aid; and on returning to the fatigue and responsibility of his exalted position, His Grace afforded uninterrupted evidence of ample mental and physical capacity and strength for the numerous demands on his time and exertions. The clergy and people of his diocese no doubt greatly rejoice that he has lived among them so long; but their very extreme solicitude for the continuance of his health and vigor has increased their desire that a coadjutor bishop should soon be appointed to relieve their venerated prelate from so many labors, and to afford him some rest, now naturally required by his remarkably protracted age.

The present Cardinal Gibbons having been preconized for the exalted position he occupies among the hierarchy of the United States by His Holiness Pope Leo XIII., the same illustrious Pontiff designated Archbishop Kenrick to invest him with the official *insignia* of rank at Baltimore. The ceremony was one of special import, and it furnished occasion for rejoicing and congratulation not alone for those who were present, but for all Catholics throughout the United States. His Eminence then publicly addressed the archbishop and said:

"It is a great joy to me, most reverend father, that you, a prelate so distinguished, have been chosen by the Sovereign Pontiff to confer upon me the insignia of the exalted office to which I have been raised, not by my own merit, but by grace and favor of the Apostolic See. We venerate you as the senior of us all in years, as well as in episcopal ordination; but still more do we revere you for your learning, your piety, your unflagging zeal,—in a word, for all those virtues of a bishop which have for so many years made you an example and a shining light to our steps in the work of ruling our dioceses and feeding the flocks committed to us with the food of sound doctrine."

It is a circumstance of very rare occurrence that a priest should live to the fiftieth year of his ordination; but it is almost unexampled in the history of the Church that one of its bishops should survive to furnish the occasion for and to witness the celebration of his golden jubilee. Yet such was the case when, on the 30th of last November, the learned, pious, and venerable Peter Richard Kenrick attained such a memorable distinction.

A long term of years had been spent in unremitting labor and with the general approval not alone of his faithful priests and people, but of St. Louis citizens that were unrecognized as members of the Church when the archbishop reached the period of his silver jubilee. As is customary in the United States, an effort was then made to induce his consent to a grand demonstration of respect and affection. However, with his habitual aversion to any movement savoring of display, he positively refused to sanction such a proceeding, although urged with reasoning and persistency by some of his most devoted friends. One parting request was then pleasantly preferred by His Grace the present Archbishop of Philadelphia, Most Rev. Patrick John Ryan, that when the date for his golden jubilee should arrive, no obstacle might be placed by Dr. Kenrick to its suitable celebration. With a self-conscious assurance that he should not reach such a term of life, the archbishop's consent was obtained for such a possible contingency; and accordingly, as his word was never known to be violated, the promise was well remembered, while as years rolled by his unimpaired good health afforded the expectation that it must be exacted in a manner alike worthy of the subject and of the object held in view.

For the arrangements projected on so extensive a scale, great expense must necessarily be incurred; but the wealth and liberality of the leading Catholics of the city and diocese were evinced in the large sums subscribed, while the clergy and other classes were spirited and generous in proportion to their means. A committee was formed, and it set steadily to work with the object of combining a thoroughly representative demonstration of respect and affection, while resolving that no charges whatever should be made from those persons entitled to be present in the public buildings prepared for the various services and ceremonies. The archbishop himself was assumed to be passive in the preliminaries, while his approval of all their proceedings was indirectly sought, and the venerable prelate graciously placed himself in the hands of his friends who had organized and directed them.

Many years have now elapsed since the writer had been ordained by His Grace in St. Louis, and the natural desire of assisting at the festival and ceremonies in course of procedure there urged a return to that city after a long absence, especially as the Archbishop of Dublin had not alone sanctioned such a tour but had cordially approved of it, with the additional honor conferred of being a representative to convey his warm congratulations to that venerable prelate. The president and professors of Maynooth were not wanting to express the feelings of his *alma mater*, while in his own name and in that of the parishioners of his native parish,

the Very Rev. Canon Daniel, P.P., of St. Nicholas, Dublin, resolved on presenting a handsomely illuminated address. Besides, a gift of Very Rev. Matthew Collier, P.P., of St. Agatha's Church, was among the most prized by His Grace of St. Louis as coming from his old friend and immediate successor in the curacy of Rathmines, and as being a fine copper-plate engraving of the Very Rev. Richard Kenrick, formerly parish priest of St. Nicholas of Myra, and whose charities and pastoral zeal have caused him to be most affectionately remembered by the people of that parish. Moreover, the portrait in question had actually belonged to the venerable Father Kenrick himself, and at the sale of his effects after death, it had been secured by Father Collier, then a young student.

It is needless to observe that a mission of this character was one presenting the most joyous anticipations of delight and satisfaction; but little was the writer prepared to realize in the actual demonstration a significance and splendor that characterized it on the whole, while the varied programme was carried out on a scale of grandeur and with an administrative ability that left nothing to be desired even in the details. However imperfect the description of such an interesting ceremonial may be, some brief notices may serve to give an idea of the manner in which the Catholics of St. Louis rejoiced over their aged prelate's life-long services among them.

Arriving in St. Louis after the middle of last November, the writer immediately visited the archbishop, who then occupied the house in which he had lived for several years previous. Meantime, the ladies of St. Louis, who took that special labor of love in hand, had furnished the new residence in a most elegant style. Furniture vans were then at the door conveying thither the archbishop's books and other articles of value. When ushered into his presence and after the first greetings had been exchanged, it was pleasing to observe that his features were still wonderfully well preserved, and that a clear complexion with a fresh color afforded evidence he enjoyed good health and vigor more than sufficient for his afternoon walk of three miles, which had yet to be taken.

Towards the close of that week preceding the ceremonial, His Eminence, James Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore, and Most Rev. Patrick John Ryan, Archbishop of Philadelphia—who had been designated to preach the sermon in the old cathedral of St. Louis on the day of the golden jubilee—arrived in St. Louis. These with Most Rev. Dr. Corrigan, Archbishop of New York and Most Rev. Dr. Williams, of Boston, were guests of the metropolitan archbishop.

On Sunday, November 29th, His Eminence, the Cardinal, and all the assembled archbishops, bishops and priests celebrated the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass in some one or other of the city churches or chapels belonging to the various religious communities; while in several instances eloquent sermons were preached, and in which appropriate allusions were made to those circumstances that had brought so many from great distances to rejoice with the people. Afterwards the *Te Deum* was sung by the various choirs.

On Monday morning, November 30th, crowds wended their way from all directions towards the old Cathedral Church, to which access could only be obtained by special tickets. Meanwhile a cavalcade of horsemen consisting of young gentlemen of highest social position in the city were escorting His Grace, Archbishop Kenrick, Cardinal Gibbons, and Archbishops Ryan, Corrigan and Williams from the Archbishop's residence to the Cathedral, the bells of which pealed forth a joyous welcome as the cortege approached. Awaiting the arrival of His Grace were more than four hundred priests in soutane and surplice drawn up in processional order within the Cathedral enclosure.

The Solemn Pontifical Mass was celebrated by His Eminence the Cardinal, Archbishop Kenrick assisting on a throne, while the music of Gounod's *Messe Solennelle* was beautifully rendered by a choir of fifty select singers under the direction of the musical professor, Mr. Joseph Otten, with an orchestra of thirty-six performers. After the conclusion of the gospel, the Most Rev. Patrick John Ryan, Archbishop of Philadelphia, advanced to a rostrum placed in front of the high altar and preached an elaborate discourse chiefly comprising a tasteful panegyric on the venerable jubilarian with a force and an eloquence calculated to impress deeply his distinguished and large audience.

When the religious ceremonies concluded in the Cathedral it was time to assemble for the clergy's banquet in the large dining room of the Lindell Hotel, and soon its corridor was filled with guests. The banquet hall was elegantly decorated, and the banquet itself was tastefully and abundantly provided for over 400 guests who sat down to dinner. Suitable toasts and speeches followed after the banquet; the Archbishop's health was proposed after an address on behalf of the clergy which was delivered by the Vicar General, Father P. P. Brady. To this the Archbishop responded in a few simple words.

In the evening, the grand torchlight procession started from the place of rendezvous. Precisely at eight o'clock, the various contingents of fifty-two city parishes, under the direction of the Grand Marshal, Julius S. Walsh, with their lighted lamps, began to file along Pine Street towards Grand Avenue. A body of the mounted

city police, commanded by Chief Harrigan, rode fourteen abreast and two deep, thus filling the entire street space, to keep the line of march open. Next moved the fine college band of the Christian Brothers, with their students in elegant uniforms. At the head of each parish was borne a transparency conspicuously displaying the name of the church patron and its number in the division. The columns on foot walked eight abreast. It was estimated that about 20,000 persons marched in line, and the Hon. D. R. Francis, Governor of Missouri, and the Mayor, Hon. E. A. Noonan, occupied a foremost place in the procession.

Arriving at the archbishop's residence, a blaze of bursting rockets rent the sky, and the spectacle was truly magnificent; while repeated cheers for the venerable prelate echoed from the ranks of the procession, and from the multitude assembled as spectators. The Archbishop and the Cardinal, with the Archbishop of New York and other visitors, took their station within the drawing-room of the mansion, and viewed the procession as it passed.

Perhaps one of the finest and most inspiring entertainments of the celebration, was the Children's Festival on the morning of Tuesday. This took place in the area of the Grand Music Hall, which has a capacity on the semicircular parterre and galleries to seat fully five thousand persons. The boys and girls were only a selection from the Catholic public schools and orphanages of the city, for the number had necessarily to be limited. The boys and girls of each band were arrayed in a costume different from every other section, and all marched in separate detachments from the Christian Brothers' and Nuns' schools or institutes, with their teachers at the head of the respective detachments.

At the hour designated, with his usual punctuality, the Archbishop of St. Louis entered the hall, accompanied by the Archbishop of Philadelphia solely, for an important meeting of the Cardinal and the other prelates had been assembled at that particular time in the Archbishop's house to arrange for the holding of a Catholic World's Congress during the Great Columbian Exhibition in Chicago.

The fine brass and stringed band of the Christian Brothers' Boys occupied the orchestra, and played selected airs at various intervals. They opened with the Golden Jubilee March, and this was followed by the childrens' Jubilee Chorus. Addresses were then read, and odes composed for the occasion were sung in the German, Bohemian, and Polish languages to fine national airs, children in the body of the hall taking up the refrain. Afterwards all the colored children throughout the hall joined in a jubilee ode. Other orphanages were in like manner received, and most touching was an address in their sign-language by the deaf mutes under the

charge of the Sisters of St. Joseph Convent, and this was interpreted in measured tones for His Grace's ear by a number of girls selected from other schools. Archbishop Ryan then thanked the children, in words suited to the occasion, on behalf of the archbishop of St. Louis who afterwards arose and pronounced a solemn benediction on all who were present.

On the evening of that day, and in the same hall, a numerous assemblage of ladies and gentlemen admitted by special tickets, awaited the arrival of His Grace, the Archbishop, His Eminence the Cardinal, and the other prelates who attended. The Hon. E. A. Noonan, the Catholic Mayor of St. Louis, on behalf of the citizens in general, delivered an address of congratulation; and he was followed by gentlemen representing various nationalities, who spoke in English, in German, in Italian, in Bohemian, in Polish, in French, and in Irish. The Governor of Missouri, Hon. D. R. Francis, also delivered an eloquent speech, in which he pronounced a glowing eulogy on His Grace the Archbishop.

The colored Catholics were represented by a Mr. Raphael F. Lewis of St. Elizabeth's parish, and he delivered an appropriate address in behalf of his liberated race. His Eminence, Cardinal Gibbons then arose amid great applause and said: "I have been requested by the Archbishop, whose voice is too weak to be heard in so large an audience, to address you, and to thank the governor of the state, the mayor of the city and the general public, without regard to religion or race, for the well-merited honors which they have bestowed upon the Great Metropolitan of the West. He has received to-night honors and tributes of which any mortal might well be proud. Kings and emperors may exact tributes of gold or silver or money, but only true greatness and goodness of character and life can call forth tributes of the heart's affection and love such as have been poured out to night. Finally, let us all pray that the Lord will keep him among us for many years to come, and that when he passes away he may receive in Heaven a crown of everlasting glory."

Numberless congratulatory addresses and letters were received, to all of which it was quite impossible for the aged prelate to return a reply. One of those messages and gifts, however, had a peculiar significance; it came from His Holiness Pope Leo XIII., and through His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, being a finished portrait of the Sovereign Pontiff himself, set in a frame-work of gold and precious stones. When informed of this, the Archbishop wrote a letter of thanks, in which he assured the Holy Father that he should ever regard the portrait with especial favor, and that he should always keep it before his eyes during the hours of day, to remind him of that love and obedience he owed to the successor

of St. Peter. Among the congratulatory messages received was one from the President of the United States.

The theme, so comprehensive in itself, and selected for this article, must furnish an apology for its length.

A coming time shall doubtless engage the freer and fuller exercise of an intellect and of a pen worthy to cope with this most interesting and important biographical and historical subject. Thank God within our own memory, and through individual sacrifices and exertions, assisted by the influences of Divine Grace, great missionary works have been undertaken and gloriously achieved in the Catholic Church of the United States. Its further progress and triumphs may fairly be anticipated and predicted. Great and good men pass away from earth, but their deeds and examples have far-reaching results, and they should live likewise in the memory of all later generations.

JOHN CANON O'HANLON.

In Memoriam.

CARDINAL MANNING.

ON the fourteenth day of January last died Henry Edward Manning, Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster. The Catholic Church in England and throughout the world on that day sustained a loss which, to human appreciation, appears well-nigh irreparable. Of the fact and extent of this loss the nations were acutely sensible. Rarely, if ever, has such a unanimous expression of grief been heard the world over as when this mighty man was laid low. Never, we venture to assert, have been accorded to any churchman such praises and honors even from non-Catholic sources as to the illustrious dead.

We may well ask what were the causes of this man's pre-eminence, whence the hold he maintained on the intellects and hearts of the millions who are sorrowing for him to-day? Why does his demise, long expected as it was, leave such a void in the English Church and such solicitude for her future? Why does Catholic England feel that she is orphaned and sorely distressed? •

The answer may, we think, be found in the distinguishing note of Manning's whole career. His high vocation, and, following that vocation, his life-work was that of mediator. A mediator, from the very nature of the office, should, nay must, have something in common with both extremes of opposition. He must, by the reach of his intellect and the breadth of his sympathies, touch both at some points. He must understand their difficulties, their prejudices, their temperaments, their points of view. He should be able to place himself alternately, and in a sense simultaneously, in the position of both sides. Accordingly, when Divine Providence selects a great high priest in the office of mediator, it often leads him forth from one class or condition to another, enabling him to cherish all his warmth of affection for those he has left, and unites him by the bonds of new found love to those whose brother he has become. His own great heart becomes a centre, drawing other hearts from the right and from the left till hands meet in the grasp of fellowship and in the recognition of a common humanity and destiny.

Such a man was the great prelate of these latter days. His whole energies and aims were those of mediator. As the radical parson at Lavington, bringing squire and clown into better mutual

understanding ; as the great advocate of infallibility,—how vividly do we remember him as he moved from seat to seat in the council chamber of the Vatican,—with argument and appeal, smoothing difficulties without receding one inch from the stand he took ; as the second Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster, slowly but surely with tongue and pen working out a peaceful, persistent revolution in English religious thought ; as a member of innumerable commissions looking to the adjustment of the relations between rich and poor ; standing between need and greed with hands of entreaty ; again standing forth for the purity of the women of England against the wiles of lust in the modern Babylon where his lot was cast ; pleading in the very evening of his days for the rights of dock laborers ; surrendering for them the ease and comfort which his weight of years so imperatively demanded ; as the valiant champion of Christian education for the waif of the alleys and the slums ; as the steadfast friend of Ireland, he was always and in every issue the mediator. Of him, more than of any man in this present generation, or even century, it can be truly said : *In tempore iracundiæ factus est reconciliatio.*

His colossal labors for the relief of the oppressed and distressed form part of the history of to-day. It were vain in this place to attempt even a brief outline of them. They are fresh in the minds of those who follow the trend of current thought and action.

What stands out, however, in boldest relief, as it appears to us, is his high achievement in bearing aloft in his own beloved England the banner of Catholic faith, his life-long work of conciliation, the profound impress he wrought upon the national life of his country, the large space he occupied upon the canvas of contemporary religious life.

Few of us upon this side of the Atlantic can realize the immense difference in the status of the Catholic Church in England between the time of Wiseman and the latter days of Cardinal Manning's career. We are removed in time and space from the outbreak of bigotry and violence which marked the nomination of the former to the See of Westminster and the re-establishment of the hierarchy in England. Yet some of us can dimly at least recall the no-popery yells which resounded throughout the land, the determination to resist Papal aggression by force, the threats of violence to the persons of representatives of the old faith, the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill of Lord John Russell, the cordons of police required for the protection of Archbishop Wiseman while engaged in his episcopal functions, the threats even against his life. It was a revival of the worst epochs of blind fanaticism which have been such a blot upon English history.

But what a change from those days ! Manning needed no civic or military guard. He was walled around by the affections of his

countrymen. He was not only safe but honored and revered as he stood at the foot of Nelson's monument pleading the noble cause of Temperance. Shoreditch and Seven Dials and Whitechapel—haunts of misery and crime—were as safe for him at midnight as Piccadilly or Belgravia at high noon. Whenever the public conscience was deeply stirred by the sudden flashing of the search-lights of the press on England's festering moral sores Manning was called into the council chamber with prince and peer and Anglican prelate. Beyond any dignitary of the Church of England, nay beyond their united influence, he was a power in the land. In every attack by good men upon high-handedness, false policy, precipitately unjust action or downright moral rottenness he was in the forefront of the battle. And thus under his sturdy, moderate, conciliatory, yet indomitable lead the name of Catholic, their social influence steadily advanced until from being despised Nazarenes, suspects, outcasts from their birthright, in the public estimation incapable, by reason of their religious tenets, of loyalty to the Crown, they gained their rightful place, and in peace and in war, in the soft amenities of life as in the crises of a nation they proved afresh, what we always knew, that a Catholic should never yield and never does yield to any in loyalty to his country.

After allowing for the softening influence of the spread of mutual knowledge and the progress of civilization no doubt remains, but that the greater part of this vast change is directly due to the influence and towering personality of Cardinal Manning. His quarter of a century's mediatorship between the estranged sections of the English people wrought good which this generation of Catholics never hoped to see. Nor could the narrow boundaries of one sea-girt nation limit his vast influence. We all know how it has reacted on this broad continent, how in every English-speaking land his name, irrespective of creed, has been enshrined in every heart, and his manliness, his great mental gifts, his labors by pen and tongue, his love of the poor and the outcast have become the precious heritage of humanity.

The year 1887 was a momentous one for the Catholic Church in the United States. The Knights of Labor, a body then of vast numbers, were threatened with excommunication. Well meaning men were alarmed at their growing influence. A change in the social structure appeared imminent. For a time it seemed likely that the masses, intoxicated by power drawn from compact organization, would at length control the classes. Labor, heretofore so submissive, seemed in a position to dictate any terms to capital. A profound uneasiness, not without some warrant, took possession of timid minds. Great pressure was brought to bear upon Rome for and against the labor organizations. It was a most anxious time for those who had the welfare of the Church at heart. In

that hour of crisis the voice of Manning rang out clear and strong urging the Holy See to trust to the moderation and good sense of the Catholics of this Republic; and in this, as in all politico-religious questions, to seek information from the bishops, who have their fingers upon the pulses of the public conscience, and are best qualified by the intimate knowledge of their surroundings to pass upon a great question of policy. None more than he knew the drift and temper of our days. "The Holy See," he urged, "under the changed and changing conditions of society, would henceforth be called upon to deal with the people rather than with princes." The result is well known. Moderate counsels prevailed. The Holy See abstained from anything that would appear to savor of precipitate action. The great question has slowly passed out of the sphere of pressing issues.

Now that the living voice, so often raised in the sacred causes of justice and mercy, is stilled forever, we may be permitted to reproduce here the great prelate's affectionate message, by phonograph, to the Catholics of the United States:

"The Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster sends greeting to the Cardinal-Archbishop of Baltimore, to the Catholics of the United States, and to the people of America, and prays that we may all be of one heart and one mind, in the one fold and one Shepherd."

As he was to us, so was he to all the world. His love of God overflowed on humanity, embracing in its wide sweep the humblest of His creatures. His career was the sublimest Catholic philosophy and theology in daily action. His every deed, the daily tenor of his life, was upon the lines of the highest Christian ideals. It was a day of triumph and of joy to Cardinal Manning when he read the magnificent Encyclical of the Holy Father on the labor question, and found embodied and developed in that immortal document the principles of humanity for which, during his whole episcopal career, he had been strenuously contending. In him the Holy See always found a staunch adherent and a wise and fearless adviser.

More than perhaps any other Catholic prelate he understood how to accommodate himself to his environment and to the changes which time necessarily brings. He was always for conciliation where no sacrifice of principle was involved. He was essentially a man of the times, fully abreast of nineteenth century demands and nineteenth century progress. Long will his name be in benediction, and those who have the interest of the Church of God at heart will pray fervently that Divine Providence will give us such men in numbers, to be, after their Divine Model, the light of the world.

J. CARD. GIBBONS.

JOHN GILMARY SHEA.

TO none is the death of the illustrious and erudite scholar, John Gilmary Shea, LL.D., a source of deeper sorrow, than to the editors and the proprietors of the AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW. By his departure from earth they have lost one of their oldest and most highly esteemed contributors. His connection with the REVIEW, and his warm interest in it, began with its very inception, and continued without interruption or abatement till the day of his death. Its first number, published January, 1876, contained an interesting and learned article from his pen on "The Catholic Church in American History." For the January number of 1891, though in feeble health, he wrote a lucid and forcible article on "The Latin Vulgate Civilizing Western Europe." During the intervening period of fifteen years he wrote for the REVIEW no less than forty-seven articles—a much larger number than any other contributor to its pages has furnished. These articles embrace a great variety of topics and are all of permanent value; careful, thoughtful and thorough expositions of the subjects they respectively treat. Subsequent to his last article, in January, 1891, he was solicited by the editors of the REVIEW to write other articles on subjects with which it was known that he was thoroughly acquainted and in which he felt a deep interest. Owing to his physical infirmities and his belief that he had not long to live, and that, therefore, he ought to devote all his time and energies to the completion of the great work he had undertaken—"The History of the Catholic Church in the United States,"—he declined to accede to our request. "*Quoniam advesperascit*," he wrote to one of the editors, "*et inclinata est jam dies*."

On Dr. Shea's many and varied acquirements, his knowledge of languages both ancient and modern, his antiquarian lore, his diligence in prosecuting his investigations, his careful discrimination in arranging and collating the results of his researches, his power of analysis and marvellous ability to seize the right clue and thread his way safely through labyrinths of confused statements, and separate truth from falsehood, rejecting the one and giving its due value to the other, we shall not dwell. These characteristics of Dr. Shea are well known to all who have read his writings, and they were all the more admirable because in him they were combined with utmost simplicity and truthfulness. It is of these last named qualities in Dr. Shea we most love to think. In our estimation they were the qualities he himself loved best and most carefully fostered. They give him a stronger claim to the admi-

ration and esteem of all who prize truth and sincerity, than do even his rare intellectual gifts and acquirements.

In this brief tribute to the memory of Dr. Shea we make no reference to the almost countless magazine articles, essays, pamphlets and books on various subjects which emanated from his fruitful pen, ever constantly and untiringly employed from early youth, till death terminated his eminently useful career. Our purpose simply is to express our high estimate of Dr. Shea's contributions to the REVIEW, leaving it to others in the present and the future to describe his invaluable services to literature and religion in other spheres of labor.

May he rest in peace.

Scientific Chronicle.

SOME LIGHT-HOUSES IN OTHER LANDS.

HISTORY does not clearly inform us when the use of guiding lights for sailors was first introduced, but it must naturally have been at a very early period. When men began to paddle their first frail boats along the shores and to venture by degrees a little further from land, yet being very careful to keep it always in sight, it must have happened that at times they were belated on the return. In such cases the advantage of a signal light on the shore would easily suggest itself, but, unhappily, the name of the one who first put this idea in practice has been lost to history. We offer him, however, even at this late day, our sincere thanks.

Probably the sea-lights mentioned in the *Odyssey* of Homer, and in the Greek poem of Hero and Leander, were merely fires kindled on the headlands. A passage in the *Iliad* (xix. 369 *et seq.*) has been understood by some to refer to a beacon-light. Homer is not writing a treatise on marine engineering, but describing the armor of his hero, Achilles. We think the passage will be better understood by giving at the same time a few lines of the context in the beautiful language of the original.

Κνημίδας μὲν πρῶτα περὶ κνήμησιν ἔθηκεν
 Καλὰς, ἀργυρέοισιν ἐπισφυρίοις ἀραρνίας·
 Δεύτερον αὖ θώρηκα περὶ στήθεσσιν ἔδυνεν.
 Ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' ὤμοισιν βάλετο ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον,
 Χάλκεον· αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα σάκος μέγα τε στιβαρόν τε
 εἴλετο, τοῦ δ' ἀπάνευθε σέλας γένετ', ἥντε μῆνης.
 Ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἂν ἐκ πόντοιο σέλας ναίτησι φανῇ
 καιομένοιο πυρός· τὸ δὲ καίεται ὑψόθ' ὄρεσφιν,
 Σταθμῶ ἐν οἰοπόλῳ· τοὺς δ' οὐκ ἐθέλοντας ἄελλαι
 πόντον ἐπ' ἰχθυόεντα φίλων ἀπάνευθε φέρουσιν·
 Ὡς ἂπ' Ἀχιλλῆος σάκεος σέλας αἰθέρ' ἵκανε
 Καλοῦ, δαιδαλέου.

A strictly literal, prose translation, which we give for the benefit of our lady readers, must of necessity be tame and unpoetical; but, since Pope tried it in verse and made a mess of it, we prefer to give it its undiluted state.

He (Achilles) first put around his shapely legs the greaves, neatly fastened with silver clasps, and then around his breast his coat of mail. From his shoulders he slung his brazen sword, with silver studs adorned, and then took up his great, strong shield, whose splendor, like to that of the moon, shone afar. But as when from the deep is reflected on the sailors a flame of burning fire which blazes high in a lonely spot on the

mountains, while the storms drive the unwilling sailors far from their friends on the fish-filled sea, so the splendor from the beautiful, cunningly wrought shield of Achilles flashed up to the skies.

If Homer knew of beacon lights, then Virgil could hardly have been ignorant of them, and he is said to have stated that one was placed on a tower of the temple of Apollo, on Mount Leucas, "the light of which, visible far out at sea warned and guided mariners." It is thought too by some that the more than gigantic statue, the Colossus of Rhodes, erected about 300 B.C., showed from its uplifted hand a signal light, just as our "Goddess of Liberty," in New York harbor, does to-day. The champions of the "lost arts" have not yet, however, as far as we have heard, claimed that it was an electric light, though we should hardly be surprised to hear of their doing so, on the first favorable occasion.

The first light-house about the existence of which there can be no possible doubt, was the famous one on the island of Pharos, near Alexandria, in Egypt. This building was the frustum of a square pyramid, surrounded by a large base, the precise dimensions of which are not known. It was commenced by the first Ptolemy and finished about the year 280 B.C. The style and workmanship are represented to have been superb, and the material was a white stone. The height was about 400 feet; and it is stated by Josephus that the light, which was always kept burning on its top at night, was visible about 40 miles. There must be a slight error here, for from the deck of any craft known in Josephus' time that light could not have been visible more than 30 miles. Anyhow it was worthy of its great builder, and was ranked as one of the seven wonders of the world. It lasted for at least 1600 years, and was possibly destroyed by an earthquake, but the date of its destruction is unknown. On account of the name of the island, the word *pharos* is used to this day for light-house in English, as *phare* is in French, and *faro* in Spanish.

In the first century of our era mention is made by Pliny, Suetonius and others of light-houses at Ravenna, Ostia and elsewhere, though scarcely any details have come down to us. During this same first century, under the auspices of the Roman emperor, Trajan, who was himself of Spanish birth, a magnificent light-house was built at Corunna, looking out on the Atlantic from the northwest coast of Spain. It remained in active service till A.D., 1634, at which time it was taken down and reconstructed. This light, the oldest in existence, almost coeval with Christianity, has, therefore, been shining for more than eighteen centuries. What scenes it has witnessed! what memories it recalls! what tales it could tell of the Roman, the Moor, the Spaniard! of struggles, defeats and victories! What acts of crime and of heroic virtue, in the long years it has looked upon. Columbus gazed upon it many a time. It is shining yet, and may it never fail till the last sea-wandering son of Adam has furled his last sail in the great haven of rest, on the shore of the other, the eternal sea. A light, infinitely more glorious still, will welcome him there.

Coming down to more modern times, we meet with the remarkable

Cardouan light-house, which was begun in 1584 and finished in 1610 by Louis de Foix, the construction having occupied 26 years. It is situated on a ledge of rocks in the mouth of the river Garonne, in the Bay of Biscay. The ledge is about 3000 feet long by 1500 broad, and is bare at low water. It is surrounded by detached rocks, upon which the sea breaks with terrific violence. There is but one place of access, which is a passage 300 feet wide, where there are no rocks, and which leads to within 600 feet of the tower.

The construction differs considerably from that of most modern light-houses. A foundation was built of solid cut stone, in the form of a frustum of a cone, the lower base being 135 feet, the upper 125 feet in diameter, and the height 16 feet, a space for a cellar and water cistern, 20 feet square and 8 feet deep, having been left in the centre. On the east side is a stone staircase, by which access to the upper base is obtained. The tower proper rests on this unique foundation. A parapet wall, 12 feet high and 11 feet thick at the top, is built entirely around the upper base and serves to break the force of the waves before reaching the tower itself. The space between this wall and the tower is solidly roofed in and contains the apartments of the keepers. The tower is 50 feet in diameter at its base, and diminishes as it ascends. It is 115 feet high and is surmounted by two lanterns, one above the other, the combined height of which is 31 feet, thus making a total height from the bed-rock to the top of 162 feet. Internally the tower is divided into four stories, all of different orders of architecture, highly ornamented, and adorned with the busts and statues of kings of France and of heathen gods. The material is stone throughout.

The lower story appears to have been intended as a store room; the second is called the king's apartments; the third is a chapel; the fourth is the lower lantern. A spiral staircase leads from one story to another. The upper lantern is, or rather was, a stone dome supported on eight stone columns. In this upper dome a fire of wood was kept burning at night for over 100 years, when, in 1717, the fire having weakened the stone columns, the upper lantern was taken down and the light kept up in the lower lantern. The light did not prove satisfactory and in 1727 an iron lantern was erected in place of the one taken down, and coal was substituted for wood as a combustible. The Cardouan has been standing for 282 years and is still considered the finest light-house in the world.

The Eddystone light has had an eventful history. The rock on which it stands is one of a group lying about 14 miles off the shore near Plymouth, England, and is exposed to the full force of the southwestern seas. Closely clustered gneiss rocks cover a distance of about 700 feet in a north and south direction, while detached masses reach out about the same distance east and west. The highest part of the rock on which the successive light-houses, exclusive of the present one, have been built just at high water level. The rise and fall of the tide is 16 feet. The first tower was designed by Henry Winstanley. The lower part, to a height of 12 feet, was a polygonal prism, 24 feet in di-

ameter. On this was erected a wooden building resembling a pagoda. The height to the top of the lantern, which was glazed, was about 80 feet. It was begun in 1696 and the light exhibited in 1698, but the storms of the following winter proved it defective; it was neither high enough to keep its head always above water, nor strong enough to promise endurance. It was, therefore, strengthened by the addition of a course of masonry four feet thick, all around the outside, and the height was increased to 120 feet. To render it more stable it was filled in solid to a height of 20 feet above the foundations. And now the light-house laughed back to the laugh of the ocean. Ah, but the ocean does not always smile. Three years later, in November, 1703, Winstanley, with a party of workmen, went to the light-house to make some repairs. On the 26th of the month a violent storm arose, and when it had passed it was found that light-house and inmates were gone, nor was any trace of either ever seen again.

Winstanley's fatal errors were, first in the use of a polygonal instead of a circular form, and secondly in adding exterior ornamentation, both of which hindered the smooth and easy flow of the waves up and down and around the tower.

Rudyard took in hand the work of building the next Eddystone tower. It was begun in 1706 and completed in 1709. It was a frustum of a cone, 92 feet high, 26 feet in diameter at the base, and 15 feet at the cornice. The work consisted principally of timber, the lower part being oak carefully bolted together and also to the rock. Iron was also used as stays, and the whole was filled in with stone to the depth of 27 feet, in order to overcome the buoyancy of the water, and resist the shock of the waves. How long it might have been able to do battle with wind and wave no one can tell, for after it had stood bravely for 46 years it was accidentally destroyed by fire. The fire commenced in the lantern in the early part of the night, and the keepers retreated from story to story till they reached the rock. Happily the weather permitted the approach of a boat, and they were rescued early in the morning.

Eddystone was rebellious, but it had to be conquered. The next to try his hand at planting a light-house on these rocks was John Smeaton. He was born in Austhorpe, in 1724, and was only 32 years old when this difficult undertaking was entrusted to him. The work was begun in 1756 and completed in 1759. The tower was 93 feet in total height, of which 77 feet consisted of masonry, the remaining 16 feet, which constituted the lantern, being of iron and wood. Smeaton introduced a great improvement in constructions of this class, by the use of large hewn stones of about a ton weight each, and especially by dovetailing the stones of each course together, and dowelling the different courses to one another, so that when set with hydraulic cement the whole structure was almost as strong as if cut out of the solid rock. This plan has been adopted in the construction of the most important stone light-houses ever since.

Smeaton has been highly praised for his work, and no doubt de-

servedly, yet there have not been wanting those who have thought it defective in some points. He somehow got an idea that the best form of tower to resist the buffeting of the waves would be the one which nature gives to the trunk of his own English oak to enable it to resist the action of the winds, that is, a curved vertical outline, splaying widely at the base. Alan Stevenson, however, believes he has shown this idea of Smeaton's to be a fallacy. Be this as it may, it proved unsuitable for that particular place.

The rock on which the tower was built is rather small, so that the lowest course of masonry, if continued round to a complete circle, could be but 32 feet in diameter. But the surface of the rock, instead of being level, was so slanting that the lower courses, till the highest point of the rock was reached, could only be laid part way round. When that height was reached the effect of the adoption of the tree-trunk idea was to narrow the tower to 26 feet in diameter, and this was still further reduced to 15 feet, by the time the coping was reached. This, say the critics, was certainly too small for a stone tower in such an exposed condition.

Another source of weakness was said to be found in the manner of constructing the floors. They were built as regular arches, keystone and all, but with only a very small rise in the centre. They naturally exerted an outward thrust against the walls all around. This thrust may be easily met in a building which has only wind pressures to resist, but when there is question of resisting the repeated blows of hundreds of tons of water, moving at a varying and unknown velocity, it is quite a different matter. Every blow jars the tower a little and gives the arches a chance to settle down a little, and that little is never recovered, and so by degrees things get loose and shaky, and sooner or later something must give.

In 1878 Mr. Douglas stated that "for several years the safety of the Eddystone had been a matter of anxiety and watchful care to the corporation of the Trinity House (an English Light-house Board), owing to the great tremor of the building with each wave stroke." Consequently, after an existence of 120 years it had to be taken down. It was also reported that the rock on which it had stood had been partly undermined by the action of the waves. In that case, one would be inclined to ask if, after all, it was not the vibrations of the rock which threatened the light-house, rather than any defect inherent in the building itself. At all events, the new one, completed by Douglass in 1882, was placed on another rock of the group. We have been unable to obtain, up to date, any details about its construction. Will it last as long as Smeaton's? We will hardly live to see.

Bell Rock Light House is another famous structure. This rock is off the east coast of Scotland, in the German Ocean. It is 427 feet long by 230 feet broad, but the "dangerous area" is about five times that size. The spring tides have a rise and fall of 16 feet; when the tide is "out" the principal rock is bare to a depth of four feet, and is covered by 12 feet of water when the tide is "in."

The tower was designed and built by Robert Stevenson, an eminent Scotch engineer. The bill for this work was introduced into Parliament in 1802. It took more than four years to get it through, and this, with a wait of some months for a favorable season of the year, delayed the beginning of the work till the summer of 1807. It was completed in 1810, the doing actually taking less time than the talking. In February, 1811, it was lighted up for the first time.

The form adopted was similar to that of Smeaton's tower, but Smeaton's errors were not repeated. We do not say this in disparagement of his talents and genius. He was undoubtedly a great engineer, and led the way in which others had but to follow. He made two mistakes, to which we have already alluded; the first, that of putting a tree trunk tower on a rock which was too small for that form. It is, however, an admirable form in itself, and where the circumstances of the location permit its adoption there is no fault to be found with it. The other mistake, which any one else would probably have made till taught better by experience, was the arching of the floors.

Profiting by both the good and the bad points of his predecessor's work, Stevenson has given us a magnificent structure in the Bell Rock Tower. The outer casing to a height of 30 feet is granite, the rest of masonry being of Scotch sandstone, which is found in abundance on the mainland near by. The stone work, including a six foot parapet which surmounts the tower proper, is 102½ feet high; the lantern rises 15½ feet above the parapet, thus making a total height of 118 feet. The diameter of the lowest course of masonry is 42 feet, that of the one just below the cornice is 15 feet. The first 33 feet from the base is filled up solid throughout. The space remaining above is divided into six stories. The floors, instead of being arched, are flat. They are of stone, stiffened with iron, and they extend entirely through the walls, thus binding the latter together and being a source of strength instead of a cause of weakness. The tower weighs 2076 tons.

Turn we now to the west coast of Scotland. At a distance of 50 miles out is the little island of Tyree, and 12 miles southwest of the island is a group of dangerous rocks named the Skerryvores. They lie in the track of large vessels passing round the north of Ireland, from Glasgow and Liverpool, and have been the occasion of many sad wrecks. In 1814 authorization was obtained to place a light-house on these rocks. The survey, which, strangely enough, was not completed till 20 years later, disclosed among the group the existence of a flat rock of solid gneiss, 160 feet long by 70 feet broad, and on this it was determined to build the tower. Besides its solidity and ample proportions, this rock has the advantage of being a little above high water level. The engineer chosen for this undertaking was Alan Stevenson, son of the engineer of the Bell Rock Tower.

Work was begun in 1838, and the light first shown in 1844. The form of the tower is a solid of revolution generated by revolving a rectangular hyperbola about its asymptote. There now! It is built entirely of granite. The diameter of the base is 42 feet, narrowing to 16 feet at

the top. The height of the masonry is 138 feet; to the top of the lantern, 154 feet. The solid portion is 26 feet high, above which the walls vary from a maximum thickness of $9\frac{1}{2}$ feet to a minimum, at the top, of two feet. Above the solid work the tower is divided into ten stories. The total weight is 4308 tons; the cost of materials and erection was £87,000 or about \$435,000.

The Scilly Islands lie 25 miles west by south, off Land's End, Cornwall, and 40 miles west from the Lizard Point. They are a cluster of about forty islands, some of which are inhabited; others are mere rocks which have well earned their reputation of "dangerous." Belonging to these, but still somewhat apart from the main group, and exposed to the worst storms of the Atlantic, is the Bishop Rock. At the highest tides it is covered to a depth of 19 feet; at the lowest tides it is just awash. A light-house was built here in 1852 by J. N. Douglass, after designs of James Walker. The masonry stands 100 feet above high water, but from the foundation to the weather vane the tower measures 145 feet, of which the lower 39 feet are solid. The walls vary from 9 feet to 2 feet in thickness. The bottom and top diameters are 34 and 17 feet respectively. The force of the waves is so great at this place that the tower began, some time ago, to show signs of weakening, and it became necessary to strengthen it with an internal structure of iron-work. Eventually it will probably have to be replaced.

A light-house quite similar to that on the Bishop Rock is the one at Carlingford, on the east coast of Ireland, built in 1830. It stands in 12 feet of water and is 111 feet high. Further details we have been unable to obtain.

A light-house on the west coast of France, on the Héhaux de Brehat, is said to be a noble and ornamental structure. It is about 150 feet high. Up to date we have failed to receive any description.

About midway between the Scilly Islands and the Lizards is another dreaded rock, the Wolf, covered at high tide by 12 feet of water. The necessity of a light at this point was long acknowledged, and a tower was planned for it by Robert Stevenson in 1823. It took 39 years to unwind all the red tape in which the project was swathed. A posthumous design by Walker was approved of in 1862, and the work was entrusted to the same Douglas, who built the Bishop Rock Light. It took eight summers to finish it, but so treacherous are the seas at this place, that in all that time only 101 working days could be counted.

In this case a new form was tried, the vertical curve being a segment of an ellipse. What particular virtue there may be in this more than in the hyperbola of Alan Stevenson is not luminously clear. From the rock to the base of the lantern is $116\frac{1}{2}$ feet, the total height being 135 feet of which 35 feet is solid. The two diameters are 42 and 17 feet. The tower contains nine stories, a peculiarity of which is that they increase in size from the lowest upward, the bottom one having a diameter of 7 feet, the top one of $12\frac{1}{2}$ feet. The total weight is 3296 tons; the cost was £62,756, about \$313,780.

One feature of this structure has been severely criticized, that is, the

scarcements, or grooves and projections, in the lower courses of masonry. It is said that they were intended to break up the waves. This, as has been said in speaking of Winstanley's Eddystone, is not a correct principle; a better one is: The more you let the water alone, the more it will leave you alone.

The Dhu Heartach Rock, which rises 35 feet above high water, is situated 14 miles from Mull, one of the Hebrides. The tower was planned and erected by D. and T. Stevenson, who spent six summers at the work. Its total height is 135 feet, the greatest diameter being 36 feet, decreasing to 16 feet at the cornice. The shaft is solid for 32 feet above the rock, the floor of the lowest story being thus 67 feet above high water. The weight is 3115 tons, of which considerably more than one-half is in the solid part. The outline is a parabola; and so, the cone itself and three of the conic sections having been tried, some engineer, seeking for fame by being different from everybody else, ought to give us the remaining possible form, viz., an arc of a circle.

There are many light-houses, scattered all over the world, well worthy of attention and admiration, but we have already trespassed too far on the patience of our readers. Besides, the ones we have touched upon, have been the models on which many others have been planned. We reserve for a future article, the light-houses of our own country.

Let us now turn our attention to a few points closely connected with the matter in hand. The construction of light-houses is a branch of marine engineering which calls for talents of the highest order. The conditions vary so widely in different cases that general rules are of but a limited application.

For example, it might be thought at first sight that the Eddystone Rock would be the most difficult place of all those named above on which to plant and maintain a light-house, and the fact that the present one is the fourth built on that spot inside of 200 years seems to confirm it. Nevertheless, on second thought, this seems more than doubtful. Thomas Stevenson says: "During a summer gale, when Dhu Heartach light-house was being erected, fourteen stones each of two tons weight, which had been fixed on the tower by joggles and Portland cement, at the level of 37 feet above high water, were torn out and swept off into deep water. At Bell Rock stones of two tons weight were several times swept away during the construction of the tower, while it is a remarkable fact that no stones were ever moved at the Eddystone. But what is more striking, the thin glass panes of Winstanley's first tower stood successfully through a whole winter's storms at the same level above the water as that at which the fourteen heavy blocks were swept away at Dhu Heartach, where it was found necessary from the experience acquired when constructing the light-house to raise the solid base of the tower to nearly the same height above the water as the glass panes in Smeaton's tower, which have hardly ever been broken during the storms of more than a hundred years. The conclusion, then, which seems fairly deducible from these facts, is that the level of the plane of dangerous impact of the waves above high water depends upon the relation subsisting be-

tween their height and the configuration of the rocks above and below high water, as well as perhaps on the configuration of the bottom of the sea near the light-house. Thus, while the rock at Dhu Heartach, from its height above high water (35 feet), forms a projection against the smaller class of waves, it operates as a dangerous conductor to the largest waves, enabling them to exert a powerful horizontal force at a much higher level than they would had the rock been lower."

This quotation may seem very long, but we could not see our way to breaking it up without running the risk of missing the point. The facts are well stated, but what shall we say of the explanation? To us it seems woefully unclear and unsatisfactory. That vague "relation between the height of the waves and the configuration of the rocks" is about as lucid as the directions for making a steam engine: "Get a sufficient quantity of steam and make your engine." One might lawfully conclude that the proper course, in the case of the Dhu Heartach Rock, would have been to blast it to sea-level before building the tower, so that the waves would strike it *at a lower point*. We do not think Mr. Stevenson would admit the conclusion, though he has fairly posed the premises.

Let us add our mite to this discussion. If it does not help to clear it up much, it can, at the worst, hardly render it more obscure. The whole business seems to be a question of water-waves.

Two kinds of water-waves are known to exist, viz., waves of *oscillation* and waves of *translation*. The simplest case is this: Take a pebble and throw it into the still water of a pond, at some distance from the shore. Where the pebble sinks there will be formed a depression more or less deep according to the size of the stone and the velocity of its fall. When the water at that spot, has reached its lowest point it must needs rise again; but on account of the momentum it acquires in rising it will mount higher than its original level, then sink below it again; and this down-and-up motion will continue, growing, however, all the time beautifully less, on account of the resistance of friction, until it ceases entirely and the water is again at rest. Now, because of the cohesion which exists between adjacent particles, the descending ones drag their neighbors down after them all around, and these in turn *their* neighbors, and so on. Hence there is formed in the water a circular depression whose centre is the spot where the pebble fell. As it takes time for this motion to be communicated from point to point, each particle in descending will necessarily lag a little behind the one which set it in motion. Each particle, therefore (counting in order from the centre outward) will reach its lowest point a little later than its inside neighbor; the depression will consequently travel gradually outward all around. But, as we have said, the water at the centre, having reached its lowest point, will ascend even higher than its original level. In doing so each particle will drag its neighbor after it, and this action will give rise to an elevation which will start out, all around the centre, in pursuit of the depression first formed. So long as the sinking and rising at the centre is kept up, so long will

these depressions and elevations follow each other in succession, and since they are circular they present the appearance of continually expanding rings. Technically, they are called *waves of oscillation*. A depressed and an elevated ring taken together constitute a complete wave. The highest point of an elevated ring is the *crest*, the lowest point of a depressed ring is the *trough* of the wave. If the oscillations at the centre are in perfect time, which is usually the case, the distance from the crest of any wave to that of the next will be everywhere the same, and this distance is the *wave-length*. The wave-length may be anything from a minute fraction of an inch to hundreds of miles, according to circumstances. The *wave* moves forward *continuously* from the centre of disturbance, but the water itself does not. It rises and falls, not all at once, for, as we have seen, it takes time for the motion to be communicated from point to point, and hence every point of each wave-length is at a different part or phase of its oscillation at any given instant. There is some movement in a radial direction, for as the water sinks it must spread out both forward and backward from the highest point, and as it rises it must be drawn in from front and rear toward the crest. But as each crest, with its accompanying trough, continually advances, the water itself *appears* to travel forward continuously. A body floating on the surface of the water will move with the water, that is, it will rise and fall, advance and recede; but it will not move continuously away from its original position.

Now let us try another experiment. We will take a perfectly smooth cylinder of iron, or other heavy material, having a base just large enough to make it stand fairly steady. We will place it upright in the water in such a way that its upper end will be some distance above the surface. Under such conditions the tendency of the waves to overturn the cylinder will ordinarily be slight. The water will rise and fall vertically along the cylinder, and, by its buoyancy, will slightly lessen the pressure of the cylinder on the bottom. The water, in its forward motion, will exert on the cylinder a pressure in that direction, and in its backward motion a pressure backward; but when the cylinder is just in the crest or in the trough, the wave exerts no pressure on it in either direction. The change from forward to backward pressure takes place so gradually that there is in it nothing of the nature of a blow or shock, and waves of this kind would usually have but little effect.

Still, there is a possible case in which the stability of our cylinder might be in danger. Every body naturally tends to vibrate at a certain rate, and that rate depends upon the dimensions and weight of the body. It is just supposable that the natural vibration period of our cylinder might happen to coincide with the time-period of the waves. In that case, the effects of the impulses would accumulate and might end by upsetting the cylinder. The chance of this taking place would, however, according to the "doctrine of probabilities," be but one among millions.

Waves of *translation* are quite different from waves of oscillation.

When a wave of oscillation nears a shore or other shallow place, the vertical motion of the water is more or less interfered with. The upward motion is free, but the downward motion is hindered by the bottom. In sinking, the wave must therefore spread out, and as it is urged on from behind, this spreading must take place mainly in a forward direction. A body of water moving thus forward in a heap is called a wave of *translation*. Each oscillating wave, then, as it arrives at a place too shallow for the freedom of its motion, is changed into a wave of translation. Unlike the wave of oscillation, it strikes a decided blow against any obstacle standing in its path, and its energy is proportionate to its magnitude and velocity and these depend on the size of the wave of oscillation from which it was generated. They depend also on the "configuration" of the shore both below and above the general water-level; if the water be shallow for a very long distance out the wave of translation will be flattened more and more as it travels onward, and will have but little energy left when it finally reaches the bank. If, on the contrary, the water be very deep, even quite close up to the land, such a wave will scarcely be formed at all. Between these two extreme cases there will be a particular slope of the shore, which will give a maximum result, but just what that slope should be has, as far as we know, never been satisfactorily determined.

Besides the mere slope of the shore there is another possible element of its configuration, whose effect is well known. When the advancing body of water (wave of translation) arrives at an inlet whose sides converge, it must accommodate itself to the continually narrowing passage and hence must rise higher and higher until its momentum is entirely spent, and this is often many times higher than it would have been on a straight stretch of shore. This will also happen, but to a less extent, when the wave passes between large masses of rocks.

Another well-known phenomenon is worth noticing in this connection. When a wave of translation is driving onward, the portion in contact with the bottom is greatly retarded by friction, each layer above less so, and the surface layers very little indeed. The result is that the upper portion keeps gaining always on the lower, and the motion of the whole thus becomes a sort of half sliding, half rolling motion, and this lasts until the surface water shoots clear ahead. This gives us the breaker. The water now having been carried by its momentum higher than the general level, it must needs retreat. In the advance the water underneath comes to a halt first, because its velocity was less. It therefore begins to retreat before the water above has finished its forward motion. This is what constitutes the *undertow*.

Gentle reader, if you have indulgently followed us thus far, without any skips, you may possibly have begun to imagine that your reporter has been dragged away in the undertow of his wave motions, and has lost sight of his light-houses entirely. Not so; but it is time to get out of the pond.

On the ocean, waves of pure oscillation on a large scale are rare. Sometimes, however, they have been caused by submarine explosions,

volcanic or seismic. An instance of this kind was furnished by the earthquake which destroyed the city of Shimoda, Japan, in 1854. The waves reached San Francisco in $12\frac{1}{2}$ hours, the distance being 4500 miles; the rate of travel was therefore 360 miles an hour. In 1868 a great earthquake occurred in Peru. The waves which it generated were observed in Alaska, the Sandwich Islands and Australia. In the deeper water of the Atlantic such waves have been known to travel at the rate of 700 miles an hour. The waves from Shimoda followed each other into San Francisco at an interval of 23 minutes, corresponding to a wave-length of 150 miles. The depth from crest to trough was $1\frac{1}{2}$ feet. Waves of this class have been called very improperly tidal waves. They have no connection with the tides.

Ordinary ocean waves are produced by the action of the wind, and though mainly oscillatory, they partake, to a greater or less extent, of the nature of waves of translation, into which they become almost completely transformed on reaching the coast.

From what we have seen, it is evident that a light-house, far out from shore, or on an isolated rock just large enough to hold it, the sides of the rock being very steep, would be less liable to be carried away than would one where the configuration of the shore was such as to change the waves of oscillation into waves of translation just before reaching the tower. The final word about the Eddystone and the Dhu Heartach is, that there must be a great difference in the slope of the ocean bed at those two spots.

If now, reader, you contemplate entering on the career of a light-house constructor, the following hints may be found useful.

Make the tower as heavy as possible and get its centre of gravity quite low, so that it will not be liable to be upset by the waves. It is useless to *fasten* a stone tower to the rock, for if be not heavy enough to stand firm on its own account it is not worth having, and any fastenings would only mask the danger without averting it.

Stone is about twice as heavy as sea-water, and when the water rises around the tower it lifts nearly one-half of the weight of the part immersed. On this account alone the foothold becomes less secure, and this, together with the straining backward and forward by the waves of oscillation and the blows of the waves of translation, produces a state of affairs most trying and terribly severe on a structure even as strong as a light-house. Iron, on the other hand, is about seven times as heavy as water. Therefore only about one-seventh of its weight would be lifted by the buoyancy of the water, and its so-called inertia is more than three times that of stone. In very dangerous positions, then, if the foundations be sufficiently strong, why not make your light-house of cast iron? It could be cast in blocks, with projections to fit and grip each other securely. It could be kept from rusting by paint, or better, could be copper-plated by the electric battery. Of course it would cost more than stone, but just think what a consolation it would be to the long-expected New Zealander, when he comes around on his artis-

tic tour, to find one at least of the works of the nineteenth century not fallen to ruins. We "vote early and often" for iron.

In any case, make the horizontal section of your tower circular, and allow no exterior projections of any kind at any point below the cornice. Then all will go smoothly, up and down and around. In the vertical section, the outline may be either a straight line or a portion of an ellipse, or of a parabola, or of an hyperbola (or an arc of a circle?). Where practicable, a curve is better than a straight line, because the upper walls need not then be so thick, and the centre of gravity is thus brought lower down.

The height of the tower must be such that under the worst conditions the water will never reach the lantern.

You will probably want to get into your tower; for that purpose you will need a door. This will naturally enter into the lowest story and be placed on the side where the force of the waves is least. This will not necessarily be on the side facing the nearest land, but may be on the side of the open sea. At times the safest side has been determined by observing on which side of the rocks sea-weeds grow most luxuriantly, for hardy as they are, they seek the most sheltered spots.

You will want a little light here and there. This can be had by means of windows. Put them on the same side as the door, but be sparing as to their number, and dimensions. We think by following these directions carefully you will have a fair chance of building a good light-house and of having it remain.

FLEXIBLE GLASS.

ANY one who has seriously reflected on the matter, must surely be convinced that one of the most important factors in modern civilization is glass. Without it, our houses would still be but little better than wigwams. Without it, we could have no microscopes, and so the whole wondrous world of "God's little things," animate and inanimate, would have remained forever unknown. Without it, we could have no telescopes, and so our knowledge of the magnificent world of "God's great things," would have always remained poor and meagre indeed. Without it, we could have, practically, little physics, and still less chemistry; and hence, the greater part of the material progress of the world would come to a dead halt, or rather it would never have had a real start. From this point of view, at least, we would still be barbarians.

Were we to attempt to enumerate all the uses to which glass is put, uses in which it could not have been replaced by any other known substance, we would never end, and hence we judge it wiser for the purposes of these notes not to begin.

Admirably as it is suited to numberless purposes, glass has, nevertheless, for certain uses, some undesirable qualities, chief among which is

its brittleness. "Brittle as glass," has long since passed into an axiomatic comparison, about the justness of which there is supposed to be no room left for doubting. Our bills for window-panes, and lamp-chimneys, and tumblers and goblets (if we are inclined that way), and for a thousand other articles of frequent use, tell the tale plainly enough.

The average man can mend a broken wheelbarrow, the average woman can darn an ancient stocking, but either of them would have to be a good deal above the average before being able to cut a square of glass to size to repair a broken window. And this is about the easiest and simplest operation one could be called upon to perform upon glass. Ask your man of average intelligence, now, to bore a hole through a plate of glass, and he will suddenly remember that he has an appointment elsewhere. And then, if there were question of actually *making* an object, such as a lamp-chimney, or a goblet—well, of course, only skilled workmen could do that.

Many attempts have been made to produce a glass which would be tough enough to stand hard usage and be workable by ordinary tools in the hands of the unskilled. The first of these qualities has, indeed, been secured by the invention of De la Bastie, which consists in heating the article after it has been worked up into its final form till it begins to soften, and then plunging it suddenly into a bath of oil. The result is a glass exceedingly hard and strong, but it cannot afterwards be worked cold. The attempt to cut it with a diamond results, it is said, in a total disintegration of the whole article, which immediately falls to fine powder. This process, therefore, solves one difficulty by introducing another and a much worse one.

The latest improvement which has come to our notice is due to Herr Eckstein, an Austrian engineer, who claims to have invented a substitute capable of replacing ordinary glass, and which will have about all of its good and none of its bad qualities. We confess that the process of manufacture, as given in the current scientific journals, is rather vaguely described, but such as it is, we reproduce it for the benefit of our readers.

Dissolve from four to eight parts of collodion cotton in one per cent. by weight of alcohol or ether. (We suspect the translator has inadvertently made a slip of some kind here, for, with the best of intentions, we have been unable to make out what "one per cent. of four to eight parts" means.) This solution is to be intimately mixed with from two to four per cent. of castor oil, or other non-resinous oil, and from four to ten per cent. of resin or Canada balsam. Next spread the mixture on a smooth surface, say a plate of glass, and dry it by a current of air heated to 122° F. In a short time it is transformed into a vitreous mass, transparent, flexible, almost unbreakable, and much lighter than ordinary glass. The material thus obtained is said to be proof against acids, alkalies and salts. If all this be true, Herr Eckstein has certainly invented a very useful substance; still we may be allowed to think that the glass-trade need not fear total extinction just yet.

The new substance, which has been named *flexible glass*, may replace

the ordinary kind for some purposes, especially as window-panes, and, perhaps, drinking vessels; but, for most other purposes, we fear it would not do. It would not answer for chemical ware, for it is inflammable; and we would want it subjected to a long and exhaustive trial before we would be willing to trust it for bottles of pure drugs and chemicals. We doubt, too, about its general serviceableness for physical apparatus, and, in fine, for any purpose where it would be subjected to high temperatures. However, the inventor himself, who is well aware of these drawbacks, is making further efforts to improve it, and we only hope that his efforts may be crowned with success.

A NEW STAR IN AURIGA.

FROM the day when the fifty oars, manned by the sons of gods, kept time to the harmony of Orpheus' voice and lyre, on the eventful journey of Jason on board the Argo to steal the golden fleece, when Auriga, the Charioteer, received a "local habitation and a name" he has faithfully carried Capella amid the starry hosts of heaven. As a reward of his fidelity a new jewel has been added to his crown, but this time the crown is around the ankle of the left leg. The new star or *Nova Aurigæ*, as it is called, is near χ and 26 *Aurigæ* and these stars are just above the left ankle of the Charioteer. But leaving the fantastic conceptions of the ancients and using the orthodox method of exact science, its location as determined at Harvard Observatory is: Right Ascension 5h. 25m. 33s., and Declination $30^{\circ} 22' 14''$. To the uninitiated truth may appear stranger than fiction. For their benefit we shall briefly state that Right Ascension corresponds to longitude on the earth, and Declination to latitude. As we know the position of a place on the earth when we know its latitude and longitude, so we know the location of a star in the heavens when we know its Right Ascension and its Declination. The *Nova* was photographed at Harvard on December 1st, 10th, and 20th, 1891, two months before it was known to be a new star. It happened that Professor Pickering and his assistants were then photographing that region of the heavens, in pursuance of the plan now being executed at Harvard of preparing a photographic map of the stars and their spectra. From these photographs it appears that the *Nova* was faint on December 1st, bright on the 10th, and had reached its maximum on the 20th.

The first recognition of the new comer was given on an anonymous postal card dated January 2, 1892, and addressed to Professor Copeland, of the Edinburgh Observatory. The card read; "Nova in Auriga. In Milky Way about two degrees south of χ Aurigæ, preceding 26 Aurigæ. Fifth magnitude, slightly brighter than χ ." The writer of this card, Thomas D. Anderson, of Edinburgh, Scotland, makes himself known in *Nature*, where he gives the following account of his observations. "It was visible as a star of the fifth magnitude for two or three days, very probably even for a week, before Professor Copeland received my postal

card. I am almost certain that at two o'clock on the morning of Sunday, January 24th, I saw a fifth magnitude star making a large obtuse angle with β Tauri and γ Aurigæ, and I am positive that I saw it at least twice subsequently during that week. Unfortunately, I mistook it on each occasion for *26 Aurigæ*, merely remarking to myself that 26 was a much brighter star than I used to think it. It was only on the morning of Sunday, the 31st of January, that I satisfied myself that it was a strange body." Since the announcement made by Mr. Anderson, the *Nova* has been carefully watched at all the principal observatories, its brightness determined, its spectrum studied, and from all the results thus far reached it seems to be a new star, which astronomers will have an opportunity to study in its process of evolution. It may be a "long-period variable" which at its maximum reaches the brightness of a fifth magnitude star, and at its minimum becomes so faint as to escape detection. In any case, if it wanes it will be carefully followed during its retreat into obscurity, and astronomers will gladly glean from it any message it may have to announce.

ELECTRIC LIGHTS AT THE WORLD'S FAIR.

WHATEVER else may be said of the managers of the approaching World's Fair, it certainly cannot be said that they "love the darkness"; on the contrary they are taking measures to be more than liberal in the matter of light. The plans approved and adopted for illuminating the grounds and buildings, when the great time comes, are on the most magnificent scale. They provide for 6776 arc lights of 2000 candle power each, and for 131,452 incandescent lamps of 16 candle power each, in all an amount of illumination equal to 3,358,132 standard candles. The Paris Exposition was a great undertaking and a great success, but in the matter of light Chicago will be far ahead. The wiring for the lights will be about ten times as extensive as it was at Paris, and will cost about \$1,500,000. Engines aggregating 22,000 horse-power will be required to run the dynamos for this illumination. Some people find it difficult to understand how a steam engine can produce light. It is very simple. The radiant energy (light and heat) of the sun got locked up ages ago, in the primeval vegetation of the infant earth; the primeval vegetation got old, sickened, died and fell, pretty much in a few heaps, and became changed into coal, all the while hanging on stoutly to its heat-and-light-giving energy; man comes along and sets the coal on fire; the coal then gives up its energy to the water in the boiler, turning it to steam; the steam gives up its energy (now the energy of pressure) to the engine; the engine gives up its energy (now the energy of motion) to the wires and magnets of the dynamo, and this energy of motion becomes electrical energy; the electrical energy of the dynamo is given up to the so-called lamps, and in them becomes again the energy of heat and light. All this is clear, too clear to be

disputed; that is, the facts, at each stage of the transformation are evident, but if you ask *how* the transformations are accomplished, you will hardly find a satisfactory answer.

"How does the rose draw its crimson from the dark brown earth, or the lily its shining white? Answer me this, son of man, and I will answer thee the other riddles of the universe."

The cycle is complete, but there are immense losses at each transformation on the way; losses due to the imperfections of our methods of transformation, but we know of no better ones just now. The cycle is complete, and, were it not for those losses, we might begin over again, and, had we time to wait, see the energy of our electric light stored up in a new vegetation, that vegetation turned into coal, the coal burned, the water turned to steam, the engine run, the dynamo worked, the light burst forth anew. The cycle is complete, but while we look on with admiration and wonder, we ought not to stop short at that, but should look back with something more than admiration and wonder to the One who first put that energy into the sun and started the great cycle, and guides it yet, on its mysterious, awe-inspiring course.

CROSSING THE ATLANTIC IN THREE DAYS.

In the days "befo' de wah," steamboat racing on the Mississippi was of frequent occurrence, at least so we are told in the veracious history books of those days. No chance for a trial of speed was ever let slip by the crews of rival companies, and every means, safe and risky, would be employed in order to win. It used even to be said, though we don't care to vouch for it, that it was not unusual to seat a young gentleman of color on the lever of the safety-valve to regulate the steam pressure. If he kept his seat, or the seat kept him, till the race was over, all was well. If the boat was blown up, another was built to take its place, and those who were left over from the former explosion were ready to try it again. But in the end the practice had to be given up, because in language more expressive than elegant, "it didn't pay."

We wonder now whether the racing going on across the Atlantic Ocean will pay in the end. It is true we have little fear of explosions. The owners of our ocean steamships are too shrewd, and there is too much at stake in the way of life and property, especially property, to allow on the Atlantic, a repetition of the dare-devil doings on the Mississippi. Still the ocean steamships are virtually racing, and the Old, as well as the New world, is egging them on. Not so very long ago, people were content if they were out of sight of land not more than ten or twelve days, in crossing the Atlantic. Later, ships were designed and built to reduce that time by degrees to as little as six days. Next comes the magnificent "Majestic" beating her own and all other previous records by making the trips from Queenstown to Sandy Hook in 5

days, 18 hours and eight minutes. We draw a long breath, and think we will bet on the "Majestic," every time, when the "Teutonic" sails in and reports that she has beaten everything on the earth, or rather on the water, by making the same voyage in 5 days, 16 hours and 31 minutes. Before this goes to press, the scales may turn again and the "Majestic" or some other ship be ahead even of this last record. Be that as it may, Mr. Carl Schurz, President of the Hamburg-American Steamship Company, states that he believes it possible to build a steamship to cross the ocean in *three* days. He would build a ship for passenger service only, and make it much larger than any now existing. He would then put in two distinct sets of powerful machinery, driving twin screws, either set being sufficient to propel the vessel as fast as any ship now afloat. Ah, well, it is difficult in these days to prophesy just what will be possible a few years hence, but knowing what a tremendous resistance is offered by the inertia of the water to the motion of a body moving in it, and knowing that this resistance increases in a much higher ratio than the speed itself, it is hard to believe that, without a radical change in the form of our ships, one could be made to come up to Mr. Schurz's prediction. Even if it could, would it pay? On both these points, the highest authorities, as well among engineers as ship owners, disagree. For the present then we think it unsafe to prophesy, and so we refrain.

FISHING BY ELECTRIC LIGHT.

Perhaps it is not an original remark to say that history repeats itself, nevertheless it often comes very near being true. As an instance we might recall the fact that the late American Indians used to go a fishing at night time, and carry lighted torches with which to attract the fish. Considering that fishes usually live in rather poorly lighted quarters, a few canoes provided with flaming torches must have been to them very like what a Fourth of July fireworks exhibition formerly was to ourselves, a thing of beauty and a joy forever, at least till they got caught. The noble white man, taking his cue from his red brother, learned to fish too by artificial illumination, and found it a success. But now, no longer content to make use of last year's political-procession torch, he must needs try the electric light. The result of this move has fairly startled the fishes and astonished the fishers. Formerly the best that could be done was to have the light above the water and depend on the fish coming up to the light; now we are more accommodating, and carry the war into Africa, by letting the light down into the very domains of fishdom itself. This, of course, can be done only by means of the incandescent electric lamp. When used in this manner, especially in connection with nets, myriads of fishes, great and small, are attracted and the hauls are immense, so much so that in the case of the salmon fisheries there is danger of overdoing it, and of rendering the species extinct. This would be as bad as killing the hen that laid the golden egg.

A curious incident is related in this matter of electric fishing. On one occasion in some experiments that were being made in this line, a very small lamp, called the pea-lamp, was used. The light was observed to be extinguished, and it was thought the lamp was broken. The net was hauled up and in it was found, among others, an extra large fish having the conducting wires in his mouth. Investigation proved that he had swallowed the lamp, light and all, and it was drawn out still burning up to its full candle power. Although it is a story of a fish, there is nothing improbable in it. The glass of the little lamp was scarcely warmer than the water, but it would not have remained so very long after its introduction into the stomach of the fish, and the diagnosis of the finny doctors would probably have been: "Inflammation of the stomach." Anyhow, it is a clear case of a novel kind of interior illumination.

AN ENORMOUS MICROSCOPE.

THE word "enormous" has, in this case, no special reference to the size or weight of the instrument in question, as if, for example, a camel or an elephant would be required for its transportation. It is merely intended to convey the idea that the microscope is one of very great magnifying power. There are, of course various kinds of microscopes, but we will pass over the classification just now, with the mere remark that, in one kind you look through the lenses at the object which is placed beyond, while in another kind a strong light is directed through the lenses upon the object, the enlarged image of which is received upon a screen. The one under consideration is of this latter kind.

Ordinarily, a microscope magnifying 1000 diameters would be considered a high-power instrument. The new microscope is calculated for a magnifying power of 16,000 diameters. Let us try to get a grip on this. The paper on which this REVIEW is printed is about the $\frac{1}{250}$ of an inch in thickness. If that thickness were magnified to the full power of this microscope, a single leaf would appear to be 5 feet 4 inches in thickness, while the thickness of an entire number would become more than the $\frac{1}{8}$ of a mile, its width $1\frac{3}{4}$ miles, and its length about $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles! Truly, a ponderous tome.

The great microscope is under construction at the Poeller Physical Institute of Munich, being expressly intended for exhibition at the Columbian Fair.

However, lest orders for duplicates should be sent in too fast, it is announced that the cost of the microscope will be about \$10,000. The light to be used for the projection of the images will be an electric light of 11,000 candle-power, and as this would heat the instrument unduly, and render focussing next to impossible, a special automatic spray of liquid carbonic acid has been contrived for the purpose of keeping things cool.

T. J. A. FREEMAN, S.J.

Book Notices.

THE STATE LAST. A Study of Dr. Bouquillon's Pamphlet. Education: to whom does it belong? By Rev. James Conway, S. J. Pustet & Co.

In our opinion, this masterful exposition and defence of the Catholic position as to the place and power of the State in education either terminates finally the so-called "Great Controversy," or sets the issue beyond the possibility of a misunderstanding. The discussion is now ended, or it has not yet fairly begun. We think our readers will join us in the hope that the former alternative will be verified. It is extremely gratifying to us to perceive that the stand taken by this REVIEW from the beginning in favor of free schools in a free State has been shown to be correct, and that the educational articles which from time to time have appeared in our pages have been appealed to as authoritative. Certainly no subject has been more repeatedly treated by able writers. Some may have thought we had given too much space to the investigation of a topic concerning which there seemed to be no dissension among Catholics.

After all that has been written during the past four months we remain where we were last year. The obligation still lies upon us of erecting and supporting our parochial schools and of keeping a vigilant eye upon the ever increasing tendency of the State to diminish our freedom of action. As attention has sufficiently been drawn to the evil consequences likely to flow from a controversy in which a section of Catholics were accused (justly or unjustly), of being willing to surrender the education of our youth into the control of the State, we prefer to draw general attention to the consoling fact that this alleged spirit has received, from all sides, a stinging rebuke. It has been clearly demonstrated that the bare cry raised of *our parochial schools in danger* is sufficient to bring to the surface an amount of stern determination which had been unsuspected because Catholics are usually calm and self-restrained. The Catholic schools of the country do not exist merely by sufferance of the State; their right to existence, founded in the rights of the family, are prior to the rights of the State; nor do we recognize in the State any other right than that of respecting, since it will do nothing to aid or foster them.

The clamor which is raised every now and then for the "un-American" institution of compulsory education is occasioned by the wrong-headedness of the State in refusing to recognize the grand educational agency which is near at hand in the Catholic Church. Holy Church has within her bosom a fully equipped machinery for educating youth, in her teaching orders, male and female, in her revealed doctrines and in her sacraments. The State, instead of invoking the aid of her most powerful auxiliary, attempts to frown down every effort of the Church by what is practically a *prohibitive tariff*. Catholics are not, indeed, excluded as educators, as their fathers were in penal days; they are simply subjected to a double taxation. Religion is looked upon as a luxury, and like other luxuries in this country, made the subject of a heavy taxation. The issue is so clear between us and the State that it is not in the power of sophistry to obscure it. The Catholic school is an essential condition to the perpetuation of the Catholic Church. Nor is it the

Catholic Church alone whose life is bound up in the denominational school. Were it not for the heavy burden which such a school entails, every denomination in the land would be supporting its own school; and it is precisely because Catholics stand almost alone in their effort to establish their own schools, that the Catholic religion represents about all that is left of Christianity in the United States.

We regard it, therefore, as a very promising outlook, that so few have given any sign of weariness at the long continuation of the struggle for Christian education. If the effort is burdensome, the reward is great and tangible. It is well to remember too, that we can stand the present anomalous condition better and longer than the State party; and the longer we do endure it, the more advantageous will be the terms of compromise when the time comes for discussing a *modus vivendi*.

Thanks to the statesmanlike action of Governor Pattison in returning a prompt veto to the "act to provide for the attendance of children at schools of this Commonwealth, and a supervisory board of education," the citizens of Pennsylvania have been so far spared the dangerous experiment of State-control which has bred trouble in less-favored portions of the Union. We commend to the serious meditation of our readers the following passage of his Excellency's remarks:

"This legislation" (House Bill, No. 143), "is the first step taken by our Commonwealth in the direction of compulsory education. That feature of a Common School system involves serious political, educational and social problems. They have not yet been satisfactorily solved by the experience of other states. In grappling with them, therefore, it is needful that sure ground should be occupied, in order that it may be successfully maintained. The State has provided, with increasing liberality, for the education of all the children of all its citizens. While it has furnished the opportunity to all, it has imposed the obligation of attendance upon none. Free attendance upon free schools seems to best befit a free people. I am well aware of the necessity claimed to exist for compelling certain classes of the people to avail themselves of the opportunity offered them; but compulsory education is such an invasion upon existing systems in our Commonwealth, that if it is to be inaugurated, it should be done under the most favorable circumstances. It will not avail to pass a law of uncertain character or so widely at variance with the popular sense of what is just that it shall be a dead letter on the statute books."

We have only one exception to take to these weighty utterances of our excellent Governor. It is not exact that "the State has provided, with increasing liberality, for the education of *all* the children of *all* its citizens." There are hundreds of schools frequented by thousands of children in Pennsylvania, schools recognized by Bill 143 as suitable for the education of youth, for which the State has nevertheless made no provision whatsoever. We do not ask the Governor to suggest to the legislature the "unconstitutional" measure of making an appropriation in favor of parochial schools. We simply remark that the lauded generosity of the State is expended upon one portion of the citizens to the exclusion, and at the expense, of another portion. Or did the framers of Bill 143 imagine they were exercising "increasing generosity" by condescending to recognize the existence and sufficiency of parochial schools at all? Certainly a man like Governor Pattison who had the intelligence to perceive that the projected compulsory act was "*widely at variance with the popular sense of what is just*," could not fall into the grosser error of maintaining that the State has provided for the education of *all* the children, simply because it has built, or is willing to

build, schools to be conducted on a system opposed to the conscientious convictions of a large section of the population. This last error would be greater than the first; for the vetoed Bill, by permitting the youth to be educated in parochial schools admitted by clear implication that the present "public school" system was inadequate to the task of properly educating "all the children of all the citizens."

The trouble arises from the timid, left-handed way in which the Commonwealth recognizes the educational agency of the Catholic Church. An educator she undoubtedly is, and always has been. She is extremely desirous of educating all the children of all her members. She has, as we have already said, her own authorized agents in her Teaching Orders. She is admirably in condition not only to instruct well disposed and well provided for children, but to care for the orphan and homeless, and to reform the wayward and fallen. She interferes with no one outside her pale; her efforts are confined to caring for her own household of the faith. If those who declaim so loudly "of the necessity . . . for compelling certain classes of the people to avail themselves of the opportunities offered them," would only recognize the necessity of giving financial aid and encouragement to the Church in her great work, we should more readily believe that their protestations are inspired by a pure love for the diffusion of knowledge. As it is, the State has not only incapacitated itself by an ill-advised amendment to the Constitution from aiding the Church, but forces Catholics to support two systems of schools, their own parochial system which they maintain from conscientious motives, and the *so-called* "public school system" which is based on principles which their conscience condemns. Heretofore, the State has respected our freedom of education fairly well; and "for this relief much thanks." All that we now ask, and all that we have any immediate prospect of obtaining, is that the State continue to pursue this "generous" policy. Until some sage shall arise in Church or State who shall devise a means of reconciliation acceptable to both sides we shall pursue the even tenor of our way. In proportion as our churches are built and paid for, we are increasingly in condition to provide for the fuller equipment and development of our parochial school system. If the clergy and faithful of the present generation have had the energy to look after the building of both the Church and the school, what is to prevent our successors from accomplishing the comparatively easy task of providing for the needs of the school alone? Let the grand struggle for Christian education go bravely on! Instead of pining away in useless regrets that no crumb of the State's "increasing generosity" is thrown to our poor schools, let us be thankful for the freedom allowed us of controlling our own schools in our own way. It is less than we are entitled to, but it is vastly more than our afflicted brethren in Europe can obtain.

HAR-MOAD; OR, THE MOUNTAIN OF THE ASSEMBLY. A series of archæological studies from the standpoint of the Cuneiform inscriptions. By *Rev. O. D. Miller, D.D.*, member of the American Oriental Society; of the Archæological Institute of America; of the Victoria Institute or the Philosophical Society of Great Britain, etc. With portrait of the author and plate illustrations. North Adams, Mass. Published by Stephen M. Whipple, 110 Main Street, 1892.

1. We read in Is. xiv., 13 ff.: "Thou saidst in thine heart: I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God; and I will sit upon the mount of congregation, in the uttermost parts of the North; I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the Most High. Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the uttermost parts

of the pit . . ." Though some commentators have understood this passage of the fallen angels, the great majority of them have seen in it a description of Babylon's pride and fall. Without excluding an allegorical reference to Lucifer, which may still be admitted in spite of scientific cavil, writers on Sacred Scripture have of late changed their explanations of the "mount of congregation" occurring in the prophet's threat. Formerly it was supposed that the King of Babylon boastfully spoke of ascending Mount Zion, and ruling there instead of Israel's Jehovah. Now we know that the Assyrians admitted the existence of a great Asiatic Olympus, a mountain-residence of the gods. This is precisely Isaiah's mount of the congregation or mountain of the assembly, the Har-Moad. Dr. Miller's archæological studies endeavor to collect the ancient traditions existing among the various nations of antiquity so far as they have reference to this mount of congregation, and to derive from them the proper archæological and historical inferences.

Had Dr. Miller limited his work to the gathering of the various national traditions, it would deserve far greater commendation than we can give it in its present form. "The author's philosophy crops out repeatedly in his work" says Mr. Whipple in his instruction "How to read this book" given on page 6. Now an author who writes in sober earnest: "As well attempt to communicate with empty space as with a Deity who merely dwells everywhere, since for all such purposes this would be the same as nowhere" (p. 436), can only gain by not allowing his philosophy to crop out.

Again, what the author says of "Genesis and geology" shows not only a want of metaphysical training, but an absence of necessary exegetical information. "Any attempt," says Dr. Miller, "to construe the first and second chapters of Genesis upon the principles of modern geology, especially in connection with the nebular hypothesis, must necessarily result, in my view, in really forced if not fanciful constructions of both theories, and absolutely in a downright injustice to the Mosaic system" (p. 422). There are certainly eminent men in both theology and geology who are of opinion that a harmony between the Mosaic cosmogony and the "nebular hypothesis" is not only possible, but that the former has even gained additional clearness from the latter. In his development of this point, the Doctor constantly confuses the first and the second creation, *i.e.*, the creation "ex nihilo" and the process of division.

The logical powers of Dr. Miller may be illustrated by the following process of reasoning; "When it is found that the Acadian character whose usual reading is Ni had the meaning of hearth, altar, God, this is sufficient to demonstrate that the God Ni was the hearth-divinity of the Acadian or Cushite race. . . . It is now known that the Etrusco-Roman civilization was derived, in a great measure, from the valley of the Euphrates. Thus it is probable that we may find in the Roman cultus of the Penates and Lares of the Latin nation a reflex of the religious conceptions and customs centring in the primitive Cushite god of the hearth. . . . (Here follow extracts from Smith's "Classical Dictionary," art. Penates; Bernard, "Dic. Myth.," art. Penates; and Mr. H. S. Maine's "Ancient Law," pp. 123, 124.) . . . But the most important fact of all is, that the Acadian or Cushite God Ni was one and the same personage with Yahveh, or Jehovah, of the Old Testament. . . . The result is, from the data that have been now submitted, that the national God of the Jews was originally one with the ancient Acadian or Cushite divinity of the hearth." The logical weakness of the first and second statements is clear to any one who will take the trouble to

express the same in strictly dialectic form. Dr. Miller himself perceives what far-reaching inferences may be drawn from the identity of Ni with Jehovah. Hence he first adds in an apologetic manner: "The fact thus brought out to light is of very great importance, though it will be received with some hesitancy among Biblical scholars." Then he goes on to protest against one or another odious inference derived from his premises: "It would be quite illegitimate to infer, from the assimilation here established, that the Jehovah of the Old Testament was originally regarded as a divinity of inferior rank, like some of the house-gods of antiquity. . . ." (pp. 34, ff.).

Having considered Dr. Miller's work from a metaphysical, logical and exegetical point of view, we may add a few of the results which the author draws from his investigations: 1. The cradle of humanity was the great plateau of Panir, situated on the high tablelands of Central Asia, near the point where the mountains of the Belurtag unite themselves to the Himalayas (p. 171). We may be allowed to remark that in the author's argument no notice is taken of the flood, or of the question whether it was universal or partial. If a universal flood be admitted by Dr. Miller, his arguments only prove that Noah's Ark remained in the locality indicated, or that the patriarch himself settled there.

2. We are able to attach to the historic development of mankind a definite chronological value, an antiquity of 12,500 years. The data from which this result is derived may be reduced to three: At the time of the world's and man's creation the sign Capricorn was in the constellation Gemini, at the winter-solstice; the sign Taurus was in the constellation Libra, at the vernal equinox; the star Vega, in the constellation Lyra, was the celestial pole, marking the Eden of the North. But "the chronology which results from this, as the practical astronomer will perceive at once, is, in round numbers, 12,500 years from the present time." In order to see the force of this method of reasoning, we must keep in mind Dr. Miller's view that the primitive revelation is written in the heavens. Thus the Gemini represent the two first men; near Vega are the woman and the serpent, marking the temptation and the fall; there too is Hercules quite close to the serpent, recalling the words "it shall crush thy head." However ingeniously the single links of the argument may have been developed, it must always seem very arbitrary to a sober critic.

3. Though we admire Dr. Miller's piety in representing Our Lord as the fulfilment of the entire circle of traditionary hopes, we are rather shocked at what appears to us a pure twisting of the New Testament terminology relating to Christ so as to bring it into conformity with the mythological terminology of the ancient nations. . . . The student will, however, find in Dr. Miller's work a valuable collection of traditionary and mythological literature concerning the great subjects of primitive revelation, and man's relation to the earth as well as the starry heavens. And since the author has given us so much precious information on these subjects, we have no blame, but only pity for him because he has not succeeded better in the fields of philosophy and theology.

R. P. BERNARDINI A. PICONIO Ord. Cap. Concionatoris . . . *Triplex Expositio Beati Pauli Apostoli Epistolæ Ad Romanos* . . . emendata et aucta per P. Michaelem Hetzenauer, Ord. Cap. Oeniponte, 1891. Typis et Sumptibus Societatis Marianæ.

If a professor of Sacred Scripture should be asked, "Which is the most serviceable explanation of the Epistles of St. Paul as yet written?" we think that he would unhesitatingly answer, "The *Triplex Expositio* of Piconius."

Since its first publication at Paris in 1703, by Jean Anisson, director of the Royal Printing House, innumerable editions have issued from the press of almost every country of Europe. In 1707 Pope Clement XI. congratulated the author on his admirable work, and encouraged him to write a triplex expositio of the gospels. Not to quote old authorities as to its value, we shall mention a few well-known modern scriptural professors. Cornely, S. J., in his *introductio spec.*, says: "The Triplex Expositio of Bernardinus a Piconio is to be praised for its conciseness, clearness and unction, and will please, even in our day, all those who cannot give much time to Scriptural studies." Ubaldi, who was professor of Sacred Scripture in the Propaganda, and also in the Pope's own seminary, writes: "Bernardinus a Piconio has written commentaries on the gospels and the Pauline epistles, the latter by far the more celebrated work. In this work the pious and learned author has omitted nothing that could help to a proper understanding of the text and the advantage of the reader. For these reasons this work was honored with special praise by Clement XI., and is wont to be preferred to other commentaries of the Pauline epistles by students of Sacred Scripture who, as is just, desire to join Biblical knowledge with piety."

No higher praise can be bestowed than this. Bernardinus was born in Picquigny, in Picardy, in 1633, hence his name, a Piconio, or simply "Piconius." He joined the Capuchin branch of the Franciscan Order of the province of Paris, and, having received the priesthood, was appointed lector or professor of theology. He filled all the important offices within the gift of his Order up to that of the first *Definitor* to the Father Provincial. The Epistles of St. Paul were his constant study and delight; that apostle, his special patron. Free at last from all other cares, he devoted all his time and study to the composition of this wonderful threefold exposition of the epistles of St. Paul. The piety and unction, not to speak of the deep learning displayed in this *opus aureum*, are shown in the beautiful prayer with which he inaugurated his book: "By Thy grace, freed from all else, this one thing I ask of Thee, O God, the Truth and Love. I desire to begin on earth that happy life of mind and heart which, trusting in Thy infinite mercy, I hope to lead for all eternity in heaven. There Thou wilt be the life of my mind, when I shall see Thee clearly, O Supreme Truth; there Thou wilt be the complete life of my heart, when I shall love Thee with all my heart. O God, Eternal Love, when, then, I shall come and appear before Thy face! O God, supreme happiness of mind and heart, when I shall see Thee face to face; when I shall love Thee with entire fullness of my heart; when united, adhering to Thee with all my soul, transformed entirely in Thee, wholly taken up and absorbed in the abyss of Thy divinity, one spirit with Thee, blessed with Thy life, I shall live with Thy blessedness!

"*This is life everlasting.* Meanwhile, O God, my whole good and the centre of all good, by Thy grace I understand that to adhere to Thee by faith and charity and to place all my hope in Thee alone, my Lord and my God, is my good and all my good; this is life, this is glory, riches, blessedness, this is all good. By Thy grace willingly and joyfully, therefore, do I choose this sacred and divine adhesion, henceforth to be occupied with Thee alone by constant prayer and by the continual meditation of Thy word, which is, as it were, the radius of Thy eternal truth and a spark of Thy divine love, and, therefore, the beginning of the life of mind and heart; for truth is the life of the mind, and love, the life of the heart. O God, confirm this which Thou hast wrought in me. Help me, O God, my salvation,

and for the glory of Thy name, uphold me by Thy grace, free from all obstacles in this sacred rest, which is also great labor. I shall live henceforth always entirely for Thee alone. That this may come to pass, let Thy face shine upon me, and have pity on me, O God, the Truth! Inflame my heart and reins, O Divine Charity! May I be enlightened by Thee! May I glow by Thee. May I be nourished with the truth of Thy speech here, until I see Thee, the Truth itself, and seeing, be nourished by Thee. May I burn with the fires of Thy speech here, until by everlasting charity I enjoy Thee, and by beatific love transformed into Thee, I may live by Thee and in Thee. Be Thou my life on earth through the illumination and warmth of Thy word until Thou be my eternal and blessed life in heaven through Thy essence, which is truth and charity."

This is the unction which pervades the whole of the *Triplex Expositio*, and which, joined to the deep knowledge of the pious author, makes his work so precious.

As is well known, Piconius begins each chapter by giving an analysis of its contents, the order and development of the argument; he then gives a paraphrase of the text, and lastly a commentary on each verse. His new editor adds to each chapter his own dogmatic, moral, ascetic and pastoral notes, especially for the use of preachers. With Maldonatus and Luzerne on the Gospels and Piconius on the Epistles of St. Paul, the preacher has all he needs for his sermons, and we say emphatically that he could not go to better authorities. Every priest should have a copy of Piconius in his library, and we would recommend this last edition of Father Hetzenauer, because it gives not only the best reading of the Vulgate Latin text, but also the best Greek text, and in the commentary he has utilized whatsoever the progress in biblical studies has shown should be corrected or added to the explanation of his devout author.

PSALLITE SAPIENTER "PSALLIRET WEISE!"—Erklärung der Psalmen im Geiste des betrachtenden Gebets und der Liturgie von *Dr. Maurus Wolter, O.S.B.* Erzabt von St. Martin zu Beuron, Zweite Auflage, Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder'sche Verlagshundlung, 1891. B. Herder, St. Louis. 2 vols., \$2.75 a vol.

In looking over these two grand volumes on the Psalms, the thought came naturally to our minds: why is it that we have nothing at all of the kind in the English language? Bellarmine's "Explanation" has been translated into English, but it is long since out of print, is excessively rare, and considering the wonderful progress made in critical Biblical studies during this century, especially as regards the Psalms, would itself demand manifold explanation. Even in the time of Calmet, the number of commentators on the Psalms as set down by him, had risen to a thousand. Since his day, particularly in Germany, the Psalms have been a favorite study. Our author tells us that he has made use of both old and new commentators but especially of Thalhoffer, Schegg and Delitzsch.

His title gives the object of his work: Psallite Sapienter! Know what you are singing, penetrate the inner holiness of the Psalms, their rich meaning, their mystical depths. His object is not merely to give a critical, scientific explanation of the meaning of those wonderful poets of heavenly song, although that investigation must necessarily constitute the firm foundation of his work. His object is rather, he says, to listen to the heavenly music of the Psalms as it came from heaven and welled up from the hearts of the singers, to seek out the longings of the Holy Spirit, now whispering softly, now roaring like the storm.

Man's highest duty is prayer to his Creator, the worship of God. In it the soul rises to its highest dignity. Its loftiest conceptions are expressed in song. In his religious worship Moses was a poet. So also in the days of Samuel, the high priest and judge, we find the choirs praising God in song. Then came David, who gave to the worship of the Lord its perfection and complete organization. He selected four thousand singers and placed over them Asaph, Ethan and Eman as leaders, with 288 others of the Levites, reserving to himself the supreme direction. He gave them for their song-book the Psalter, begun by himself and completed by the heavenly-inspired poets—holy music, which has passed from the Old to the New Law—holy song, which was accompanied by various musical instruments, according to the seasons and festivals of the year.

Our Divine Lord set His own seal of confirmation on these blessed hymns of the Old Law. His lips uttered them from his tenderest years even to his last sigh on the cross. The Psalter is not only a holy book of songs, but also a canon of Messianic prophecies, illustrated and fulfilled in the life of Jesus Christ. Is it any wonder then, that through Jesus, the Psalter became even dearer and holier to the Apostles, than it had been before? (Col. iii., 16; Eph. v., 18.) The Psalms are quoted nearly one hundred times in the New Testament. The Apostolic Church introduced them at once into the Liturgy. Even the children committed them to memory and all the congregation joined in the sacred song at the Introit of the Mass, the Gradual, the Offertory and Post Communion.

The old "Itala" version, which was a translation from the Septuagint, was the translation of the Psalms used by all, and it is the only part of the Sacred Scriptures which could not be changed in the Vulgate edition, so opposed were all the people to any alteration in the sacred song they had so long been accustomed to. We need not dwell on the Hebrew text of the Psalms we now have and which is that of the Masoretic rabbis of the seventh century; nor shall we speak of the Septuagint version which follows closely the Hebrew text extant in the days of the Ptolemies, long before the advent of Jesus Christ. The old "Itala" version is a literal translation of the Septuagint and was twice reviewed and corrected according to the original Greek by St. Jerome. This great Doctor's translation made from the original Hebrew, although, by far the best version extant, was not incorporated into his Vulgate edition, for the reason we have given.

The order in which the Psalms are given is that established in the times of Esdras and Nehemias. About ninety of them were composed by King David; the others by Moses, Solomon, by the sons of Core, Asaph, Ethan and Eman and other unknown writers. Their division into *five* books, or the Pentateuch, corresponding to the five books of Moses, is very ancient: that division depends on the Doxology which is found at the end of the 50th, 71st, 88th, 105th, and 150th Psalm.

Our author had published the first volume of this work as far back as 1869. He was still engaged with the second volume when on the 8th of July, 1890, he was called to his eternal reward. He had revised the first half of the second volume at the time of his death. Should the reader desire to form a good idea of the value of this treasure-house, we would refer him to the author's Commentaries on the Messianic Psalms, viz., Psalms 2, 15, 21, 44, 71, 109, but especially to Psalm 21, the Psalm Jesus Himself recited as His own dying song, "*My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?*" David's prophecy of the Passion of our Divine Lord.

In conclusion we can only express again the ardent desire that we may soon have an English translation of some such commentary as this of Dr. Wolter on the Psalms.

AMERICAN CATHOLICS AND THE ROMAN QUESTION. By *Monsignor Schroeder, D.D., Ph.D.* New York: Benziger Brothers, 1892.

Mgr. Schroeder's article on the Temporal Power of the Supreme Pontiff which appeared in our last number was universally recognized, not only in America but also in Europe, as so timely and masterful that we rejoice to greet it once more in its present expanded and more durable shape. The first duty of a sincere Catholic is enthusiastic loyalty to the Vicar of Christ, and that the American Catholics, lay and cleric, are foremost in their allegiance to their spiritual chieftain has been proved by demonstration time and again; never more brilliantly than when the news arrived of the sacrilegious invasion of the Holy City by the hordes of Victor Emmanuel on September 20, 1870. In no part of Christendom did the clamor of indignation rise more loudly or uncompromisingly than in this free republic. Nor has that sentiment been modified or blunted by time. The colossal wrong is not condoned by the Catholics of America. *Aeternum volvunt sub pectore vulnus*. But why keep it *sub pectore*? Why not give open expression to their feelings? They have done so with firmness and dignity on every favorable occasion. Sympathy with the Holy Father; indignant protests against each successive outrage inflicted upon him; the assurance that his children in America are determined to aid him with voice and money have time and again been wafted over the Atlantic. Let us not be tempted to imagine that the outspoken words of a great and free people fall unheeded. They carry encouragement to the august old Prisoner in the Vatican and dismay into the ranks of his foes. In this question, as in many others, the position of Holy Church is much stronger than it might seem to a superficial observer to be. Brute physical force may bluster; but moral force is on every occasion the ultimate victor. It is the fundamental principle of Christianity that Providence overrules all. How the drama which is acting before our eyes will end, we leave to Providence to work out. As far as human agency can bring things to a satisfactory conclusion, it is the prerogative of the Pope to give directions. It is his affair first of all; whilst we are attending to our special duties, he is constantly and intently watching the signs in the heavens and taking advantage of circumstances as they rise. To undertake to give him advice, resembles the absurdity of boys and school-mistresses during the late war who thought they knew better when to advance and retire than the generals in the field. We do not just now remember that any true Catholic in America has weakened on the question of the Temporal Power, but we are very certain that if any one should raise his voice to advocate unworthy compromises, he would receive speedy punishment in the universal condemnation of the Catholic body. It is not expected of us that we do more than hold fast to our present position. We are not called on to "resist unto blood;" the Supreme Pontiff asks only for sympathy. Backed by the moral support of his loyal children, he, the conqueror of Barbarossas and Bonapartes, will again issue triumphant from his trials. "Usurping Italy," says Mgr. Schroeder, "does not fear anything so much as this manifestation of Catholic sentiment. It is on this account that she has interfered at home with the petitions which were being drawn up in favor of the Pope. . . . Italy will not be able long to resist such a pressure from the public conscience, and

must finally decide herself to make up her mind to pay her 'international debt.' The unanimous expression of a sentiment so just, so noble, and so legitimate, will be considered everywhere as the voice of Eternal Justice, whose echo resounds in the hearts of the believers of the Old World and of the New."

Dr. Schroeder also remarks with truth that attachment to the Holy See is not the distinguishing badge of any race or tongue amongst American Catholics. Regardless of extraction, we are thoroughly at one upon this subject. If we have not all protested with equal loudness or frequency, this has been owing solely to the fact that all of us have not equal faith in the efficiency of mass meetings and Congresses. Some of us have an instinctive dread of public assemblages gathered for religious purposes. But since the "Spirit of the age" clamors for meetings and conventions, let us have them by all means and patiently tolerate incidental inconveniences in view of their prospective benefits.

JESUS CHRIST; OUR SAVIOUR'S PERSON, MISSION AND SPIRIT. From the French of the *Rev. Father Didon, O. P.* Edited by *Right Reverend Bernard O'Reilly, D.D., D.Lit.* (Laval). With an Introduction by His Eminence, James Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore. With many illustrations. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1891.

The fact that this new Life of Christ, by Père Didon, within a few months of its publication in the original French reached its twentieth edition, is sufficient evidence of the estimate placed upon it by French reading Catholics. That it will be held in like high esteem by English reading Catholics we have not the slightest doubt. At first thought it may seem strange that now-a-days almost countless Lives of Christ are composed and published; and, this too, not only by Christians, real or nominal, but also by avowed skeptics and infidels of every school and phase of thought. Yet in reality it is not at all strange. Our Lord Jesus Christ is the central personage in all human history. With His nativity ancient history ends and modern history begins. All the predictions and prophecies, all the faiths and beliefs, all the myths and legends, all the desires and hopes and expectations, lucid and consistent or obscure and confused, of all nations that existed before Him, intelligent or ignorant, refined and cultured, or barbarous and savage, alike look forward to His coming into the world. From His coming into the world, and by his coming, were determined the fate and destiny of all pre-existing nations, and also the whole subsequent course of history. Eliminate HIM, ignore HIM, and *all* history, both *before* and *afterwards*, becomes a riddle without any intelligent explanation; a mere chronicle of events, political, military, intellectual, religious, without any sufficient, intelligible cause or connection.

Hence it is, that avowed skeptics and infidels, that rationalists and heretics, as well as truly devout believers in Christ, have felt themselves *compelled* to undertake to write *His Life*. All alike *must* do it—these to give a reason for their faith, those to endeavor to palliate and excuse their disbelief.

Evidently, this thought was in the mind of the distinguished Dominican, the eminently learned and devout Père Didon. Turning away from brilliant prospects of winning renown as an eloquent preacher, he buried himself for years in the houses of his Order in Corsica and Paris, devoting himself, heart and soul, to meditating on the Life of his

Divine Master. He spent two years in Germany, studying Christian Apologetics, and all the systems of anti-Christian criticism. He made two journeys to the Holy Land, traversing it repeatedly in every direction, visiting and revisiting every locality mentioned in the Gospels, noting all their surroundings, and, with his artistic genius, taking in and indelibly impressing on his memory every feature of the landscapes, while tracing and retracing, step by step, our Divine Lord and Saviour's journeys in Galilee, Judæa, and Samaria—lovingly and devoutly lingering longest where He longest tarried.

Thus prepared and equipped by long and careful study of all the branches of knowledge bearing on his proposed undertaking, by minute and painstaking investigation, by devout reflection and meditation, Père Didon wrote this Life of Christ. He has written for the reading masses, yet his book meets the demands of criticism.

It is an admirable work; written in simple and dignified style, befitting the majesty of its subject; it depicts our Blessed Redeemer in the two-fold light of His Humanity and Divinity, in the scenes and surroundings, in the midst of which He lived and amongst the people whom he labored to enlighten and convert. While strictly preserving the form of a simple narrative of what our Divine Lord said and did, it conclusively refutes the sophistical objections of rationalists and infidels, showing that our Blessed Redeemer was not a mythical personage, nor one whom, though a real historical person, His followers unduly eulogized and exalted after his death, but that the Gospels are authentic and perfectly truthful statements of what their respective authors, writing under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, have recorded of the sayings and doings of Christ our Divine Lord.

The typographical execution of the work well comports with the value of the contents.

LOYOLA AND THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM OF THE JESUITS. By the Rev. Thomas Hughes, S. J. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1892.

To those who, like ourselves, cannot command the leisure necessary to peruse the ponderous tomes in which Father Pachtler has expounded the Jesuit system of education in the *Monumenta Germaniæ Pædagogica* this able essay of Father Hughes will come as a grateful substitute. We congratulate the Scribners upon their fairness and large-mindedness in calling upon a Jesuit to contribute this brief analysis of the educational history and methods of the greatest of teaching corporations to the series of *The Great Educators*. The old-fashioned way was to commit such a task to some writer whose chief recommendation would be an intense hatred of the Company of Jesus, and whose lucubration would be only a rehash of exploded calumnies.

The first and bitterest enemies of the new society instituted by St. Ignatius were the Universities, whose usefulness had departed and whose ire arose from seeing their work superseded by their new rival. The Universities could *teach* but could not *educate*. The Jesuit system aimed at training each individual youth not only in intellectuals but also and chiefly in good morals. The students at the Universities were disorganized mobs; the students at the new Jesuit colleges were thoroughly organized armies. In the conflict it was easy to foresee which party would carry off the palm of victory, if there were any virtue in the principle of the survival of the fittest. The most earnest and efficient professors and scholars joined the ranks of the Jesuits; the others vented

their impotent rage at beholding the decreasing popularity of their institutions, by calumnies and revilings, many of which still survive by force of tradition.

After a rapid sketch of the educational history of his Order Father Hughes devotes the second part of his essay to a critical analysis of the *Ratio Studiorum*, or system of studies, which was the outcome and crystallization of forty years' actual experience in the schoolroom. It will surprise many of his readers to find that pedagogic science is not so recent as one might suppose from the incessant boasting which fills the air. The Loyolan system of education had little to learn from more modern efforts in the way of arrangement of courses and grades, and has been unsurpassed for thoroughness in details. The fundamental principle inculcated by St. Ignatius to attend to one thing at a time and not pass on till that be mastered brought forth generations of solidly learned men; the method at present in vogue amongst us of cramming an immense quantity of all sorts of intellectual food into the undeveloped minds of children is raising up around us a generation of superficial parrots who have not even the merit of knowing that there are thousands of things they have no conception of. At a time when so much attention is being devoted to the improvement of educational methods it is well for Catholic educators to take an inventory of their own resources. St. Ignatius was as truly a vessel of election for the educator of Christian youth as St. Thomas was for students of divinity. Let us improve and expand his method in the light of new developments, but let us build upon our own foundations, taking out of our treasures new things and old.

CHRISTIANITY OR INFALLIBILITY. BOTH OR NEITHER. By the Rev. Daniel Lyons. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. 1891.

The subject of this work forms one of—indeed it is not too much to say that it forms—the crucial question of our age, and not only of our age, but of all ages. For if our Blessed Redeemer did not so constitute His Church that by virtue of His continual assistance, her Visible Head and Sovereign Pontiff ever has been, is and ever will be preserved from all possibility of erring in teaching all things that He has commanded, then is the Christian religion a falsehood and the Christian faith a delusion. The Reverend author of the work before us has clearly stated this alternative in his preface.

. . . . "To believe," he says, in a supernatural revelation, and in a living, infallible Witness, Guardian and Interpreter of the same, is most reasonable; but to believe in the one and to reject the other is logically indefensible. For what reasonable grounds can such a man have for his belief in the specific truths of said revelation? How can he determine, with the certainty which divine faith presupposes and demands, what those truths are in detail, and what is their genuine meaning? To the truth-seeker, therefore, as well as to the Christian believer, who wishes to have an adequate reason for his faith, the question of Infallibility is of the first and most pressing importance. Indeed, it may be said to be the only question; for the doctrine of Infallibility goes to the very root of the Christian controversy, and supplies the only complete and thoroughly satisfactory solution of the many and grave difficulties which it involves. . . . Complex as the controversy may appear, after all, when analyzed, it presents but this single issue, viz., did God appoint for all time a living, infallible Witness, Guardian and Interpreter of His revelation.

With the proof and explanation of this *fact*—the infallibility of the

Church—the volume before us is wholly occupied. In its first chapter the author states the dogma of Papal Infallibility, shows what it really means, and exposes the almost countless misrepresentations of its meaning by those who deny it. In the two next chapters he states the reasons “Why Catholics Believe in the Dogma of Infallibility.” In the two following chapters he shows “How Catholics Meet the Objections to Infallibility.” Three appendices are then respectively occupied with showing “The Happiness of Converts” (owing to the certitude of their faith), with a statement of “Some Facts Relating to the Vatican Council,” and “Pontifical Decrees and the Obedience Due to Them.” Following each chapter are numerous notes, citing the different works the author has consulted.

We regard the volume as a very valuable addition to our Catholic literature. It ought to be in the possession of every intelligent Catholic layman.

THE MEMOIRS OF RICHARD ROBERT MADDEN, M.D., F.R.C.S. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co.

Dr. Madden was born in Ireland in the year 1798, and he died in his native land in the year 1886. He was a successful physician, an untiring philanthropist, a voluminous writer, an extensive traveller, and a loyal Irishman. One who knew him well has said of him:

“Few men have seen so much of the world, mingled in so many stirring scenes, or with persons of greater eminence, or accomplished a larger share of useful and permanent work than that brave old man, whose talents are attested in each and all of his forty published volumes; and whose life is well worthy of being chronicled, not only on account of its almost romantic character, but also because of his eminence as a *litterateur*, and his achievements as a philanthropist.”

Dr. Madden left abundant material for this Memoir, and it is to a great extent autobiographical. His son Thomas More Madden, M.D., has used the material to advantage, and we have the result in a neat 12mo. volume of 325 pages filled with delightful stories of adventure and travel, and narrating the personal reminiscences of an observant man, who visited all parts of the world, and met most of the distinguished people of his time. His career was indeed varied. In one chapter we read of his experience in the hands of Bedouin robbers in Palestine, in another we find him prescribing for a distinguished Turk, and in a third he tells us of his meeting with President Jackson whom he found sitting on the verandah of the White House smoking a short meerschaum pipe.

Now he stands before the pyramids of Egypt, and addresses them in poetic measures, and again he gazes upon the Falls of Niagara which he speaks of as the grandest sight in the world. It would not be safe to travel with the doctor's memoirs as a guide book. He says that Albany is sixty miles from Philadelphia. Perhaps they travelled by some unknown short road in those days.

Throughout his long life he wrote a great deal of poetry; some good, some tolerable, and some bad. One of the best pieces in the book is an ode to the King of Terrors (death), which he wrote in Rome when very sick. This was in early life on the occasion of his first visit to the Eternal City, which he entered penniless, after a walk of thirty-nine miles, and after spending seventeen hours on the road without rest or food. A poem addressed to death on such an occasion ought to be realistic. Many of the doctor's poems are very like those of John S. Saxe, and they will not add to his literary reputation.

But it is hardly fair to find fault where there is so much to praise. A book of this kind gives to us an opportunity to visit scenes far distant and changed, and to meet persons illustrious when living, but now numbered with the illustrious dead. It teaches us how to do good and how to avoid evil, and therefore it is an entertaining, instructive book which may be heartily recommended.

MANUAL OF CHURCH HISTORY. By the Rev. T. Gilmartin, Professor of Ecclesiastical History, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth. Vol. II. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son; London: Burns & Oates. 1892.

In our review of the first volume of this excellent work we explained its purpose and plan, viz.: that it purposed to be "a class-book for ecclesiastical students who have to read a course of Church History in a comparatively short time." What we said of that first volume, we here repeat, and with emphasis, of the second. "That the Rev. author has more than fulfilled his word. That he has given us a most excellent summary of Church history—a summary useful not only to ecclesiastical students who have to take a short course, but useful also to the crowd of 'college' men who are supposed to absorb a sufficient knowledge of Church history without any course whatever."

As in the former volume, so in the present one, the author's style is clear and simple. Carrying out his excellent system of marginal notes, he offers the student most admirable assistance and suggestions of the utmost value. Beginning, in the present volume, with the pontificate of Gregory VII., he conducts us step by step, with clearest vision and safest judgment, through the splendid reign of that great pontiff, through the great controversy on investiture, through the pontificate of Innocent III., through the struggle between the Papacy and the Hohenstaufens, through the history of the crusades, the rise of religious orders, scholasticism, mysticism, inquisition and schism, down to the sixteenth century. We especially like his chapters on the inquisitions (Roman and Spanish) and the Great Schism of the West. Treating of the inquisitions he is fair and honest, concealing nothing, shirking nothing. This period of his history will, we are sure, meet with general approval. Equally honest and sound is he in his treatment of the Great Schism of the West. Taking it all in all, it is many a day since we have had the pleasure of reading a work so generally and so eminently satisfactory and trustworthy. It is most creditable to the high ability of its author, an honor to old Maynooth, and will assuredly do much for the glory of the Church.

PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL ECONOMY. By *Father Matteo Liberatore, S. J.* Translated by Edward Heveage Deking. London: Art and Book Company. New York: Benziger & Co. 1891.

This was the last work of the great Jesuit philosopher, Liberatore, written for young men when he was eighty years old. He began to teach philosophy in 1834 and wrote this volume in 1888. His object was to enunciate the Catholic principles which must be the foundation of all true science, and so also of Political Economy. He tells us in his preface that his reason for writing it was "that our young men, not only laymen, but clerics also, had need of initiation in economic science, because it is interwoven with almost all the affairs of civil life; whilst I found no course of instruction fitted to be a safe guide for them. My intention, therefore, was to prepare something like a compendium of sound principles, that would suffice to put young men on the right road

along which they might proceed safely." After an introduction on Political Economy as an art and a science, and its subordination to Political and Moral Science, he divides his work into three parts, viz., Production, Distribution and Consumption, with an Appendix on Workmen's Associations. Coming out, as it does now in an English dress, so soon after the Encyclical of Leo XIII. on the Condition of the Laboring Class, it will be particularly welcome to all, but especially to college students. We are sure it will be immediately introduced as a text-book. It could have no better guarantee than the name of Liberatore who has ever been a faithful student and disciple of the Angelic Doctor, St. Thomas.

THE RELATIONS OF THE CHURCH TO SOCIETY. Theological Essays. By *Edmund F. O'Reilley, S. J.* (sometime Professor of Theology in Maynooth College at St. Bruno's, in North Wales, and in the Catholic University of Ireland). Edited, with a Biographical Notice, by Matthew Russell, S. J. John Hodges: Agar Street, Charing Cross, London. 1892.

Of the eminent ability of Father O'Reilley to lucidly and thoroughly discuss the important subjects comprised in his work, the high estimation in which he was held by Cardinal Newman, Cardinal Cullen, the Right Rev. Dr. Brown, Bishop of Shrewsbury, the Right Rev. Dr. Furlong, Bishop of Ferns, the present Archbishop of Dublin, and by the late Father Beckx, General of the Society of Jesus, and by other distinguished Prelates in Ireland and England, sufficiently attest.

Suffice it to say, that the volume before us comprises learned and thoughtful essays upon "Revelation and the Natural Law," the "Nature of the Catholic Church," "The Pastoral Office of the Catholic Church," "The Infallibility of the Catholic Church," "The Church's Legislation," "The Church's Executive Power," "The Clergy," "Education," "Church Property," "The Teaching of the Church," "Papal Infallibility," "The Obedience Due to the Pope," "Liberty of Conscience," "The Council of Constance," "Marriage," "The Church and Politics," "The Pope's Temporal Power."

As we have already said, the essays on these and collateral subjects are learned, thoughtful, and instructive.

THE SONGS OF SAPPHO. By *James L. Easby-Smith*. Published for Georgetown University. Washington, D. C.: Stormont & Jackson. 1891.

A little gem, we are sure, every literary man capable of judging will pronounce this book. Together with a brief memoir of Sappho it gives us in smooth, flowing verse a translation of the odes and most of the fragments of that wondrous singer. The work was done, the author tells us, during his year as Senior at Georgetown University. Both to himself and his Alma Mater it is highly creditable. The work is doubly precious from the fact that, together with the translation the author has given us the odes and fragments in the original Greek—giving first, the original and then the translation. It will, we are sure, commend itself to the attention and command the respect of all lovers of beautiful thought.

THE CEREMONIES OF SOME ECCLESIASTICAL FUNCTIONS. By the *Rev. Daniel O'Loan*, Dean of Maynooth College. Nassau Street, Dublin: Browne & Nolan, Printers and Publishers. 1891.

This is an excellent ceremonial. We greatly like its arrangement.

We like it moreover for the system of marginal notes running all through the work. We think, however, that it would have been an improvement if the author had arranged the functions of the various participants in the ceremonies under distinct and separate headings or articles. This, however, may be but a matter of taste and in no material way detracts from the value of the work. The book is in every way a credit to the publishers. We wish it the largest measure of success.

THE WISDOM AND WIT OF BLESSED THOMAS MORE. Being Extracts from such of his Works as were written in English. Collected and edited by *Rev. T. E. Bridgett, C. SS. R.*

This work is entirely independent of the *Life and Writings of Sir Thomas More*, by the same author, and may be regarded as supplementing it.

After a very interesting and valuable introduction the author arranges his selections into five chapters or parts respectively, entitled: Ascetic, Dogmatic, Illustrative of the Period; Fancies, Sports and Merry Tales, Colloquial and Quaint Phrases.

The title of the work, "Wit and Wisdom," well comports with the character of its contents. It would be hard to find another such collection of true wisdom and keen, pungent, yet gentle wit and humor as this volume contains.

RITUALE ROMANUM, PAULI V. Pontificis maximi jussu editum. Et a *Benedicto XIV*, auctum et castigatum. Cui novissima accedit benedictionum et instructionum appendix. Editio tertia post typicam Ratisbonæ, Neo Eboraci et Cincinnati. Sump-tis Chartis et typis Congregationis Typographi.

We welcome the newest edition of Pustet's well known Ritual. Of course, as was to be expected, the book gives us little or nothing that is new in the way of information. In regard to matter all Rituals are, for the most part, alike, but as to order and arrangement they are oftentimes widely different. And it is in this regard that we consider Pustet's Ritual the superior of any now in use.

We therefore cheefully recommend it.

MARY, QUEEN OF MAY; AND OTHER "AVE MARIA" ESSAYS. By *Brother Azarias*, of the Brothers of the Christian Schools. The "Ave Maria;" Notre Dame, Indiana.

This little volume comprises three short essays respectively entitled, "Mary, Queen of May," "Mary and the Faithful Departed," and "Mary in Heaven." They briefly but lucidly state and explain the relations of Mary with the faithful on Earth, with the souls in Purgatory, and with the saints in Heaven. The work is a gem. Every paragraph is pregnant with thought beautifully expressed while the animating spirit of the whole is that of the profoundest love and devotion to the holy Mother of God.

THE REASONABLENESS OF THE PRACTICES OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. By *Rev. J. J. Burke*. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1892.

This little work is intended as a companion and sequel to another work by the same author, on "The Reasonableness of the Ceremonies of

the Catholic Church." Its principal object is to explain to persons unable to procure larger and more expensive works, the meaning and purpose of the practices of the Church. In this the Rev. author has been very successful.

THEOLOGIA MORALIS PER MODUM CONFERENTIARUM. Auctore Clarissimo *P. Benjamin Elbel, O. S. F.*, novis curis edidit *P. F. Irenaeus Bierbaum, O. S. F.* Volumen Secundum, Pars V., De Dominio atque Ve Contractibus; Pars VI., De Restitutione Puderbonæ, 1891. Ex Typographia Bonefaciana. Benziger Bros. New York.

In our January number we called attention to the first four parts of this new edition of Elbel's Moral Theology and the special claims it had for the theological student and the clergy. Any of the old editions are rarely met with; therefore this new edition ought to be welcomed by all students and should find a place alongside of Lehmkuhl, Koenigs and Sabetti in a priest's library.

THIRTY-TWO INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE MONTH OF MAY AND FOR THE FEAST OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN. From the French by *Rev. Thomas F. Ward*. New York: Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1892.

These are truly admirable instructions; eminently practical; entirely free from false sentimentalism and animated with a spirit of fervent piety.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

THE TRIAL OF MARGARET BRERETON. By *Pleydell North*, author of "M. le Cure," "Russian Violets," etc., etc.

PHILIP; OR, THE MOLLIE'S SECRET. A Tale of the Coal Regions. By *Patrick Justin McMahon*. Philadelphia: H. L. Kilner & Co.

SAN SALVADOR. By *Agnes Tincker*, author of "Signor Monaldini's Niece," "Two Coronets," etc. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1892.

ONE HUNDRED THESES ON THE FOUNDATIONS OF HUMAN KNOWLEDGE. By *Merwin-Marie Snell*. Washington, D. C. Published by the author. 1892.

CHRISTIAN ANTHROPOLOGY. By *Rev. John Thein*, with an Introduction by Prof. Chas. Herbermann, Ph. D., LL.D. New York: Benziger Brothers. 1892.

THE GLORIES OF DIVINE GRACE. A Free Rendering of the Original Treatise of P. Eusebius Nieremberg, S. J. By *Dr. M. Jos. Scheeben*. Second Edition. New York: Benziger Brothers.

PERIODICAL

70750

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

